arXiv:1701.05798v2 [math.RT] 2 Mar 2017

FACTORIZABLE MODULE ALGEBRAS

ARKADY BERENSTEIN AND KARL SCHMIDT

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to introduce and study a large class of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras which we call *factorizable* by generalizing the Gauss factorization of (square or rectangular) matrices. This class includes coordinate algebras of corresponding reductive groups G, their parabolic subgroups, basic affine spaces and many others. It turns out that products of factorizable algebras are also factorizable and it is easy to create a factorizable algebra our of virtually any $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra. We also have quantum versions of all these constructions in the category of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. Quite surprisingly, our quantum factorizable algebras are naturally acted on by the quantized enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ of the dual Lie bialgebra $\mathfrak{g}^*$ of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Definitions, Notation, and Results 3
2.1. Quantum factorization 4
2.2. Classical factorization 8
3. Proofs 11
3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.3 11
3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.4 12
3.3. Proof of Proposition 2.5 13
3.4. Proof of Corollary 2.6 14
3.5. Proof of Theorem 1.7 14
3.6. Proofs of Theorems 2.8 and 2.11 16
3.7. Proof of Theorem 2.13 23
3.8. Proof of Proposition 2.16 25
3.9. Proof of Proposition 2.17 25
3.10. Proofs of Theorems 2.23 and 2.26 25
3.11. Proof of Proposition 2.29 30
References 30

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to introduce and study a class of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras which we call *factorizable* by generalizing the Gauss factorization of (square or rectangular) matrices.

More precisely, let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex semisimple Lie algebra. Given a commutative $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra A_0 (i.e., $\mathfrak{g}$ acts by derivations), we say that a commutative $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra A is *factorizable over* A_0 if there exists a $\mathfrak{g}$-equivariant embedding of algebras $\varphi : A_0 \hookrightarrow A$ such that the $\mu \circ (1 \otimes \varphi) : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ is an isomorphism of vector spaces (where μ denotes multiplication in A and A^+ stands for the subalgebra of highest vectors in A). Factorizable algebras abound in "nature" with $A_0 = M_0^*$, the graded dual of the Verma module M_0 (actually, M_0^* has a commutative algebra structure isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[U]$ and such that $\mathfrak{g}$ acts by derivations, where U is the maximal unipotent subgroup of the corresponding Lie group G). Our first result shows that the natural objects in the representation theory of $\mathfrak{g}$ are factorizable.

Theorem 1.1. *Up to a localization, the algebra $A = \mathbb{C}[G/U]^{\otimes n}$ is factorizable over $A_0 = \mathbb{C}[U]$ for any $n \geq 1$.*

Remark 1.2. If we replace $\mathbb{C}[G/U]$ with $A_1 = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ and let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_m(\mathbb{C})$, then up to localization by principle minors, $A_1^{\otimes n} = \mathbb{C}[Mat_{m,n}]$ $(n \geq m)$ is factorizable over $\mathbb{C}[U_m^-]$ where U_m^- is the group of all lower unitriangular matrices in $SL_m(\mathbb{C})$. This recovers the Gauss factorization of $m \times n$ matrices.

It turns out that factorizability of module algebras is not difficult to establish and reproduce.

Theorem 1.3. *For any complex semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, we have:*

(a) (Theorems 2.23 & 2.26) Let A be $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra such that A contains a subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[U]$, invariant under the $\mathfrak{g}$-action and let A^+ denote the subalgebra of all highest weight vectors in A. Then the algebra $A' = A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ has a natural $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra structure, such that A' is factorizable over $\mathbb{C}[U]$.

(b) The assignments $A \mapsto A'$ define a functor R from the category $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras containing $\mathbb{C}[U]$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra to the category $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{g}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras which are factorizable over $\mathbb{C}[U]$ (a full subcategory of $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$).

We can think of R as a "remembering" functor because it is right adjoint to the "forgetful" functor $F : \mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{g} \to \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$. Clearly, the composition $R \circ F$ is isomorphic to the identity functor on $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{g}$. Now $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$ has a natural multiplication such that for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$, the tensor product $A \otimes B$ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra, plus the embedding $\mathbb{C}[U] = 1 \otimes \mathbb{C}[U] \subset A \otimes B$.

Proposition 1.4. *(Proposition 2.29) $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{g}$ is closed under the natural multiplication on $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$.*

However, neither category is monoidal because each lacks a unit object. It is possible to fix the issue in both categories by tensoring over $\mathbb{C}[U]$ rather than over $\mathbb{C}$ (see the discussion in Remark 2.30, where we make this more concrete).

It turns out that we can build factorizable algebras over $\mathbb{C}[U]$ out of $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebras, where $\mathfrak{b}_-$ is the lower Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. In fact, all factorizable algebras can be obtained this way.

Main Theorem 1.5. *(Theorems 2.23 & 2.28) For any semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, the assignments $A \mapsto A^+$ defines a functor P from $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$ to the category $\mathfrak{b}_- - \mathbf{ModAlg}$ of $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebras. Moreover, the composition $P \circ F$ is an equivalence of categories $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{g} \widetilde{\to} \mathfrak{b}_- - \mathbf{ModAlg}$.*

Remark 1.6. Informally speaking, the theorem asserts that the "forgetful" highest vector functor $A \mapsto A^+$ from $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{g}$ to $Alg_\mathbb{C}$, in fact, "remembers almost everything."

The functor P from Theorem 1.5 is highly nontrivial: it involves a quite mysterious $\mathfrak{b}_-$ action on A such that A^+ is a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-invariant subalgebra (see Section 2.2 for details). Namely, the action of the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{b}_-$ is inherited from that of $\mathfrak{g}$, but the action of the nilpotent generators f_i of $\mathfrak{b}_-$ is given by the formula

$$f_i \triangleright a = f_i(a) - h_i(a)x_i \tag{1.1}$$

for $a \in A$, where h_i is the i-th Cartan generator and x_i is the i-th "near-diagonal element" in $\mathbb{C}[U]$ $(\subset A)$.

It is not difficult to show that $f_i \triangleright A^+ \subset A^+$, but it is much harder to prove that the operators $f_i \triangleright$ satisfy the Serre relations (Theorem 2.23).

It turns out that all of the above results (including the mysterious Serre relations) can be quantized as well. Namely, we replace $\mathfrak{g}$ with its quantized enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and proceed as follows. Given a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra A_0, we say that a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra A is *factorizable over* A_0 if there exists a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-equivariant embedding of algebras $\varphi : A_0 \hookrightarrow A$ such that the map $\mu \circ (1 \otimes \varphi) : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ is an isomorphism of vector spaces. By quantizing our default choice of A_0 in the classical case, we will now focus on $A_0 = \mathbb{C}_q[U]$, the quantized coordinate algebra of U (which is isomorphic to $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_+)$).

Theorem 1.7. *Up to a localization, the algebra $A = \mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes} n}$ (the braided n-fold tensor power of $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]$) is factorizable over $A_0 = \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ for any $n \geq 1$.*

Remark 1.8. If we replace $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]$ with $A_1 = \mathbb{C}_q[x_1, \dots, x_m]$, the algebra of q-polynomials and let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_m(\mathbb{C})$, then the braided n-th tensor power $A_1^{\underline{\otimes} n} = \mathbb{C}_q[Mat_{m,n}]$ $(n \geq m)$ is factorizable over $\mathbb{C}_q[U_m]$, up to localization by principle minors. This recovers the Gauss factorization of quantum $m \times n$ matrices (see, for example, [2]).

As in the classical case, factorizability of module algebras in the quantum case is also easy to establish and reproduce.

Theorem 1.9. *For any complex semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, we have:*

(a) (Theorems 2.8 & 2.11) Let A be a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra such that A contains a subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$, invariant under the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and let A^+ denote the subalgebra of all highest vectors in A. The vector space $A' = A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ has the structure of a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra and is factorizable over $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$.

(b) The assignments $A \mapsto A'$ define a functor R_q from the category $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras containing $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module subalgebra to the category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras which are factorizable over $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ (a full subcategory of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$).

We can think of R_q as a "remembering" functor because it is right adjoint to the "forgetful" functor $F_q : \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q \to \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$. Clearly, the composition $R_q \circ F_q$ is the identity functor on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$. In order to tensor multiply objects of these categories, we need to "trim" it a bit. Namely, we consider the full subcategory $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ consisting of *weight* module algebras in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ satisfying some additional mild conditions (see Section 2.1). It turns out that $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ has a natural *braided* tensor product which we denote by $\underline{\otimes}$ (see, e.g. [5] and Section 2.1 below). Similar to the classical case, for $A, B \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, $A \underline{\otimes} B$ is naturally in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ with an embedding $\mathbb{C}_q[U] = 1 \underline{\otimes} \mathbb{C}_q[U] \subset A \underline{\otimes} B$. As in the classical case, this natural multiplication of course lacks a unit object.

Since $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ is a full subcategory of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, we can define $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ as the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ and $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ inside $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$.

Proposition 1.10. *(Proposition 2.16) $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ is closed under the braided tensor multiplication in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$.*

That is, the category $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ of factorizable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebras is "almost" monoidal but it lacks a unit object as in the classical case.

Similar to the classical case (Theorem 1.5), we can build factorizable module algebras over $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ out of some module algebras. However, unlike the expected $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$-module algebras, we will deal with $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebras, where $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is the dual Lie bialgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and all factorizable algebras are obtained this way.

Main Theorem 1.11. *(Theorems 2.8 & 2.13) For any semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, the assignments $A \mapsto A^+$ defines a functor P_q from $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ to the category $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \mathbf{ModAlg}$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebras. Moreover, the composition $P_q \circ F_q$ is an equivalence of categories $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q \widetilde{\to} U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \mathbf{ModAlg}$.*

Remark 1.12. In the spirit of Remark 1.6, the theorem asserts that the assignment $A \mapsto A^+$ is the forgetful functor which "remembers almost everything."

Remark 1.13. We firmly believe that the emergence of the Lie bialgebra $\mathfrak{g}^*$ here is not a mere coincidence, but rather a manifestation of the "semiclassical story" behind the quantum one. We plan to investigate it in a separate publication, when all relevant objects are Poisson algebras with a compatible action of the Poisson-Lie group G, where its Poisson-Lie dual G^* emerges naturally.

The functor P_q from Theorem 1.11 is highly nontrivial: it involves a quite mysterious $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ action on A such that A^+ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-invariant subalgebra (see Section 2.1 for details). Namely, the Cartan subalgebra action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is inherited from that of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, but the action of the generators $F_{i,1}$ and $F_{i,2}$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is given by the formulas

$$F_{i,1} \triangleright a = F_i(a) - \frac{x_i a - K_i^{-1}(a) x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \quad F_{i,2} \triangleright a = \frac{x_i K_i^{-1}(a) - a x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \tag{1.2}$$

for $a \in A^+$, where K_i is the i-th Cartan generator of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, $q_i = q^{d_i}$, and x_i is the i-th generator of $\mathbb{C}_q[U] \subset A$.

As in the classical case, the most non-trivial part of the proof of the main theorem is to show that operators $F_{i,1}\triangleright$ and $F_{i,2}\triangleright$ given by (1.2) satisfy the quantum Serre relations, which we establish in Theorem 2.8 (and, which is not difficult, but still surprising, in (1.2), all operators $F_{i,1}\triangleright$ commute with all $F_{i,2}\triangleright$).

2. Definitions, Notation, and Results

In this section, we will recall (or introduce) the relevant definitions and notation necessary to present our main results, which will also be included. We begin by defining the main object of study in this paper: module algebras.

Definition 2.1. Let $\Bbbk$ be an arbitrary field and H a $\Bbbk$-bialgebra. A $\Bbbk$-algebra A is called an *H-module algebra* if it is an H-module, multiplication $(-)\cdot(-) : A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A \to A$ is a homomorphism of H-modules, and $h(1) = \epsilon(h)$ for $h \in H$, where ϵ is the counit of H. That is to say, if we denote (in sumless Sweedler notation)

$\Delta(h) = h_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)}$ for $h \in H$, then for $a, b \in A$, $h(a \cdot b) = h_{(1)}(a) \cdot h_{(2)}(b)$ and $h(1) = \epsilon(h)$. A homomorphism of H-module algebras is a homomorphism of H-modules and algebras. We will denote the category of H-module algebras by H-**ModAlg**.

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra over $\Bbbk$, then we will shorten "$U(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra" and "$U(\mathfrak{g})-$**ModAlg**" to "$\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra" and "$\mathfrak{g}$-**ModAlg**", respectively.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple complex Lie algebra, with $I \times I$ symmetrizable Cartan matrix $C = (c_{i,j})$ and fixed choice of symmetrizers, $(d_i)_{i \in I}$, for C (i.e. $d_i c_{i,j} = d_j c_{j,i}$ for $i, j \in I$) such that $\min\{d_i \mid i \in I\} = 1$. $\mathfrak{g}$ has Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. $\mathfrak{h}^*$ has basis $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$, the simple roots of the associated root system. Let $(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfying $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_i c_{i,j}$. As usual, we set $\alpha_i^\vee := \frac{2\alpha_i}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}$. $\Lambda = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid (\alpha_i^\vee, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}\ \forall i \in I\}$ is the set of integral weights. $\omega_i \in \Lambda$ is the i-th fundamental weight, which satisfies $(\alpha_i^\vee, \omega_j) = \delta_{i,j}$ for $i, j \in I$. W is the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$, generated by the simple reflections $\{s_i \mid i \in I\}$, and has longest element w_0. Given $w \in W$, $R(w)$ is the set of all $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |I|\}^m$ such that $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_m}$ is a reduced expression for w.

2.1. **Quantum factorization.** Throughout this section, all tensor products will be taken over $\mathbb{C}(q)$ unless otherwise specified and written $- \otimes -$ rather than $- \otimes_{\mathbb{C}(q)} -$.

$U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is the quantum enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, generated by elements $\{K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \mid i \in I\}$ subject to the relations

$$K_i K_j = K_j K_i; \qquad K_i K_i^{-1} = K_i^{-1} K_i = 1;$$

$$K_i E_j K_i^{-1} = q_i^{c_{i,j}} E_j; \quad K_i F_j K_i^{-1} = q_i^{-c_{i,j}} F_j;$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^k E_i^{(k)} E_j E_i^{(1-c_{i,j}-k)} = \sum_{k=0}^{1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^k F_i^{(k)} F_j F_i^{(1-c_{i,j}-k)} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j;$$

where $y_i^{(n)} = \frac{1}{(n)_{q_i}!} y_i^n$, $(n)_{q_i}! = (1)_{q_i} (2)_{q_i} \cdots (n)_{q_i}$, $(m)_{q_i} = \dfrac{q_i^m - q_i^{-m}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$, and $q_i = q^{d_i}$. $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is a Hopf algebra with comultiplication (Δ), counit (ϵ), and antipode (S) given on generators by

$$\Delta(K_i^{\pm 1}) = K_i^{\pm 1} \otimes K_i^{\pm 1}; \qquad \epsilon(K_i^{\pm 1}) = 1 \qquad S(K_i^{\pm 1}) = K_i^{\mp 1};$$

$$\Delta(E_i) = E_i \otimes K_i + 1 \otimes E_i; \qquad \epsilon(E_i) = 0; \quad S(E_i) = -E_i K_i^{-1};$$

$$\Delta(F_i) = F_i \otimes 1 + K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i; \quad \epsilon(F_i) = 0; \qquad S(F_i) = -K_i F_i.$$

$\mathcal{K}$ is the Hopf subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by all K_i (as a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra), while $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$ (respectively $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$) is the Hopf subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by all $K_i^{\pm 1}$ and E_i (respectively $K_i^{\pm 1}$ and F_i). We will assume henceforth that all $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules are integrable. In other words, if M is a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module, we will assume that $\forall x \in M, i \in I$, $\exists n \geq 0$ such that $E_i^n(x) = 0$. Note that every $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module is a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module, so we are assuming these are "bounded above". We do not assume the same for the action of F_i. For a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module M, we designate $M^+ := \{m \in M \mid E_i(m) = 0\ \forall i \in I\}$, the set of "highest vectors". If A is a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module algebra, then A^+ is a subalgebra.

Suppose M is a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module. For each $i \in I$ and $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$, set $\ell_i(x) = \max\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid E_i^\ell(x) \neq 0\}$ and $E_i^{(top)}(x) = E_i^{(\ell_i(x))}(x)$. Given $w \in W$ of length m, $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$, and $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$, we also use the shorthand

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(x) = E_{i_m}^{(top)} E_{i_{m-1}}^{(top)} \cdots E_{i_1}^{(top)}(x)$$

and define $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(x) = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ by the following:

$$a_k = \ell_{i_k}(E_{i_{k-1}}^{(top)} E_{i_{k-2}}^{(top)} \cdots E_{i_1}^{(top)}(x)).$$

Lastly, for $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \ldots, j_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, we set $E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{j})} := E_{i_m}^{(j_m)} E_{i_{m-1}}^{(j_{m-1})} \cdots E_{i_1}^{(j_1)}$.

Definition 2.2. Let A be a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module algebra, $w \in W$, and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$. If $E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(x) \in A^+$ for all $x \in A \setminus \{0\}$, then we say A is $\mathbf{i}$-*adapted*. We say a basis $\mathcal{B}$ for A is an $\mathbf{i}$-*adapted basis* if

(1) $E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b) = 1$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}$.
(2) The restriction of $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ is an injective map $\mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, where m is the length of w.

If there exists any $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$ so that A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted, then we say more generally that A is *adapted*.

It turns out that if if A_0 possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis for some $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$ and is a "large enough" $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module subalgebra of A, then A is factorizable over A_0. The following theorem makes this precise.

Theorem 2.3. *Let A be a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module algebra. Given some $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$, let A_0 be a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module subalgebra of A possessing an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis $\mathcal{B}$. Denote by $\mu : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ the restriction of the multiplication of A to these $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module subalgebras inside A. Then*

(1) *μ is an injective homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules.*
(2) *μ is an isomorphism if and only if A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$.*

We will prove Theorem 2.3 in Section 3.1. Theorem 2.3 demonstrates a close relationship between being $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and being factorizable over a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module subalgebra possessing an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis. The following theorem explores this relationship from a different angle.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$ and suppose A is an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module algebra with a $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module subalgebra A_0. Then $\mu : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ as in Theorem 2.3 is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules if and only if A_0 possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$.*

Theorem 2.4 is proved in Section 3.2. We now restrict our focus to a specific $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra, namely $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$. As a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra, $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is generated by the set $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$, subject to the quantum Serre relations:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^k x_i^{(k)} x_j x_i^{(1-c_{i,j}-k)} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j.$$

The $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module structure on $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is summarized in the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} K_i^{\pm 1}(x_j) &= q_i^{\mp c_{i,j}} x_j \quad \forall i, j \in I \\ E_i(x_j) &= \delta_{i,j} \quad \forall i, j \in I \\ F_i(x) &= \frac{x_i x - K_i^{-1}(x) x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \quad \forall i \in I, x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]. \end{aligned}$$

The first author and A. Zelevinsky observed in ([1], Proposition 3.5) that $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ possesses a basis $\mathcal{B}^{dual}$ such that, for $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$, the restriction of $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{dual}$ is injective. Note that they use the notation $\mathcal{A}$ in place of $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and view it only as a $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_+)$-module. As hinted by the notation, $\mathcal{B}^{dual}$ is the so-called "dual canonical basis". In Section 3.3, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.5. *Given any $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$, $\mathcal{B}^{dual}$ is an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis for $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$.*

Combining Proposition 2.5 with Theorem 2.3, we are led to the following corollary, though it does still require some proof.

Corollary 2.6. *Let A be a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra containing $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module subalgebra. If there exists a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra A' containing A as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module subalgebra, such that A' is generated by $(A')^+$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra, then $\mu : A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U] \to A$ as in Theorem 2.3 is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules.*

Corollary 2.6 will be proved in Section 3.4 and provides us with the means to prove Theorem 1.7, which we do in Section 3.5. In the meantime, there are two families of quantities that arose in the proof of Corollary 2.6:

$$x_i a - K_i(a) x_i \quad \text{and} \quad F_i(a) + x_i \frac{K_i^{-2}(a) - a}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$$

where $i \in I$ and $a \in A'$. These quantities are equally valid to consider for $a \in A$, without the assumed presence of A'. If $a \in A^+$, then both of these quantities are also in A^+. It is therefore natural to ask what relations the families of operators $L_i - R_i K_i$ and $F_i + L_i \frac{K_i^{-2}-1}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$ satisfy, where L_i (respectively R_i) represents left (respectively right) multiplication by x_i. Or to put it another way, do these operators indicate the action of a known algebra which is somehow related to $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$? We can answer in the affirmative. It can be proved

that both of the families of operators observed in fact satisfy the quantum Serre relations and the two families "almost" commute with each other. This resembles an action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, which we now define for the reader's convenience.

Definition 2.7. $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is a Hopf algebra, generated by $\{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$ subject to the following relations for $i, j \in I$ and $k \in \{1, 2\}$:

$$K_i^{\pm 1} K_j^{\pm 1} = K_j^{\pm 1} K_i^{\pm 1}; \quad K_i K_i^{-1} = K_i^{-1} K_i = 1;$$
$$F_{i,1} F_{j,2} = F_{j,2} F_{i,1}; \quad K_i F_{j,k} K_i^{-1} = q_i^{-c_{i,j}} F_{j,k};$$
$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^k F_{i,k}^{(\ell)} F_{j,k} F_{i,k}^{(1-c_{i,j}-\ell)} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j.$$

The comultiplication (Δ), counit (ϵ), and antipode (S) are given on generators by

$$\Delta(K_i^{\pm 1}) = K_i^{\pm 1} \otimes K_i^{\pm 1}; \qquad \epsilon(K_i^{\pm 1}) = 1; \quad S(K_i^{\pm 1}) = K_i^{\mp 1};$$
$$\Delta(F_{i,1}) = F_{i,1} \otimes 1 + K_i^{-1} \otimes F_{i,1}; \quad \epsilon(F_{i,1}) = 0; \quad S(F_{i,1}) = -K_i F_{i,1};$$
$$\Delta(F_{i,2}) = F_{i,2} \otimes K_i^{-1} + 1 \otimes F_{i,2}; \quad \epsilon(F_{i,2}) = 0; \quad S(F_{i,2}) = -F_{i,2} K_i.$$

After some tweaking and combining of our operators with the inherited Cartan action, we see that our operators really do indicate the presence of a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra structure. The following theorem summarizes and is proved in Section 3.6.

Theorem 2.8. *Let A be a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra containing $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module subalgebra. Then A is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra with action given by*

$$K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright a = K_i^{\pm 1}(a), \quad F_{i,1} \triangleright a = F_i(a) - \frac{x_i a - K_i^{-1}(a) x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \quad F_{i,2} \triangleright a = \frac{x_i K_i^{-1}(a) - a x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}.$$

In particular, the subalgebra A^+ is invariant under this action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ and is therefore a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module subalgebra.

Theorem 2.8 is in some sense a statement about the existence of a functor. To make this precise, we introduce a category whose objects bear properties similar to those found in Theorem 2.3.

Definition 2.9. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ be the category whose objects consist of pairs (A, φ_A), where

- A is an adapted $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra such that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U] \setminus \{0\})$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$.
- $\varphi_A : \mathbb{C}_q[U] \hookrightarrow A$ is an embedding of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras.

A morphism $(A, \varphi_A) \to (B, \varphi_B)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ is a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras $\psi : A \to B$ such that $\psi \circ \varphi_A = \varphi_B$.

Given a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras $\psi : A \to B$, it follows that $\psi(A^+) \subseteq B^+$, so $\psi|_{A^+}$ may be thought of as a map of $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebras $A^+ \to B^+$. If ψ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, $(A, \varphi_A) \to (B, \varphi_B)$, then actually $\psi|_{A^+}$ is a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebras. As a consequence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.10. *There is a functor $(-)^+ : \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q \to U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \textbf{\textit{ModAlg}}$ (denoted $P_q \circ F_q$ in Section 1) which assigns to an object (A, φ_A) of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ its subalgebra of highest vectors A^+, equipped with the $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra structure of Theorem 2.8. $(-)^+$ is given on morphisms by restriction.*

Theorem 2.3 strongly suggests that $(-)^+$ might actually be an equivalence of categories. In fact, this is the case, but in order to describe a quasi-inverse, we need the following theorem which describes a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra structure on $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ if A is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra.

Theorem 2.11. *If A is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra, then $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ has the structure of a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra satisfying the following formulas:*

$$\begin{aligned}(1 \otimes x_i)(a \otimes 1) &= K_i(a) \otimes x_i + (q_i - q_i^{-1})F_{i,2}K_i(a) \otimes 1\\ K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= K_i^{\pm 1}(a) \otimes K_i^{\pm 1}(x)\\ E_i \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= a \otimes E_i(x)\\ F_i \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= (F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2}K_i(a)) \otimes x + \frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \otimes x_i x + K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes F_i(x).\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.11 will be proved in Section 3.6. As a result, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.12. *There is a functor $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U] : U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \boldsymbol{ModAlg} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ which assigns to a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra A, the pair $(A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U], 1 \otimes id)$, where $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is given the $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module structure of Theorem 2.11. $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is given on morphisms by $\psi \mapsto \psi \otimes id$.*

The following theorem says that $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is the promised quasi-inverse for $(-)^+$.

Theorem 2.13. $(-)^+ : \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q \to U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \mathbf{ModAlg}$ *and* $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U] : U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \mathbf{ModAlg} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ *are quasi-inverse equivalences of categories.*

Theorem 2.13 is proved in section 3.7. Now, it is well-known that if A and B are $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebras, then so is the braided tensor product $A \underline{\otimes} B$. $A \underline{\otimes} B$ has multiplication given by $(a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b') = a\mathcal{R}_{(2)}(a') \otimes \mathcal{R}_{(1)}(b)b'$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is the universal R-matrix for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and we use sumless Sweedler notation $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{(2)}$. The R-matrix is of the form

$$\mathcal{R} = q^{\sum_{i,j} d_i (C^{-1})_{i,j} H_i \otimes H_j} \left(\prod_{\alpha > 0}^{\leftarrow} e^{\frac{(q_\alpha - q_\alpha^{-1}) E_\alpha \otimes F_\alpha}{q_\alpha^{-2}}} \right)$$

(see Section 3.3 in [5] for details). We define a subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ on which this tensor product will make sense.

Definition 2.14. Let $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ whose objects consist of pairs (A, φ_A), where A is additionally assumed to be a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebra.

The following proposition is then clear.

Proposition 2.15. $(-)^+$ *and* $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ *restrict to equivalences between* $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ *and* $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) - \mathbf{WModAlg}$*, the category of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-weight module algebras.*

If (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) are objects of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, then we already saw that $A \underline{\otimes} B$ is also a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebra. Furthermore, it is obvious that $1 \otimes \varphi_B$ and $\varphi_A \otimes 1$ are injections $\mathbb{C}_q[U] \hookrightarrow A \underline{\otimes} B$. However, it is not immediately obvious that $A \underline{\otimes} B$ is adapted with $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \underline{\otimes} B \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U] \setminus \{0\})$ $\forall \mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$. Nevertheless, this is the case, which the following proposition asserts.

Proposition 2.16. *If (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) are objects of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, then $(A \underline{\otimes} B, 1 \otimes \varphi_B)$ and $(A \underline{\otimes} B, \varphi_A \otimes 1)$ are objects of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ as well.*

Proposition 2.16 is proved in Section 3.8. Proposition 2.15 allows us to turn Proposition 2.16 into a statement about $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebras. We define two "fusion" products on the category of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-weight module algebras, namely the following:

$$\begin{aligned}A * B &:= ((A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]) \underline{\otimes} (B \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]), 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathrm{id})^+\\ A \star B &:= ((A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]) \underline{\otimes} (B \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]), 1 \otimes \mathrm{id} \otimes 1 \otimes 1)^+\end{aligned}$$

The reader may be bothered that the objects $(A \underline{\otimes} B, 1 \otimes \varphi_B)$ and $(A \underline{\otimes} B, \varphi_A \otimes 1)$ are not (necessarily at least) isomorphic despite having equal underlying $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. An attempt to force a common quotient leads to the discovery of an interesting $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra structure on $A \otimes B$ if A and B are $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-weight module algebras.

Proposition 2.17. *Let A and B be $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-weight module algebras. Then the $\mathbb{C}(q)$-vector space $A \otimes B$ has the structure of a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-weight module algebra satisfying the following equations*

$$\begin{aligned}(a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b') &= q^{\sum_{i,j} d_i (C^{-1})_{i,j} (\alpha_i^\vee, |b'|)(\alpha_j^\vee, |a'|)} aa' \otimes bb' \\ K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes b) &= K_i^{\pm 1}(a) \otimes K_i^{\pm 1}(b) \\ F_{i,1} \triangleright (a \otimes b) &= K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes F_{i,1}(b) \\ F_{i,2} \triangleright (a \otimes b) &= F_{i,2}(a) \otimes K_i^{-1}(b).\end{aligned}$$

for weight vectors $a, a' \in A$, $b, b' \in B$, and $i \in I$, where $|\cdot|$ indicates weight.

Proposition 2.17 is proved in Section 3.9 and induces a fusion product on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$:

$$(A, \varphi_A) \diamond (B, \varphi_B) := (((A, \varphi_A)^+ \otimes (B, \varphi_B)^+) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U], 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathrm{id}).$$

2.2. **Classical factorization.** Throughout this section, all tensor products will be taken over $\mathbb{C}$ unless otherwise specified and written $- \otimes -$ rather than $- \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} -$. We also assume henceforth that every algebra is commutative unless otherwise stated.

The semisimple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with Cartan matrix $C = (c_{i,j})$ is generated by elements $\{e_i, f_i, h_i \mid i \in I\}$ subject to the following relations:

$$[h_i, h_j] = 0; \qquad [e_i, f_j] = \delta_{i,j} h_i;$$

$$[h_i, e_j] = c_{i,j} e_j; \quad [h_i, f_j] = c_{i,j} f_j;$$

$$(\mathrm{ad}\ e_i)^{1-c_{i,j}}(e_j) = (\mathrm{ad}\ f_i)^{1-c_{i,j}}(f_j) = 0$$

where as usual $(\mathrm{ad}\ x)(y) = [x, y]$ for $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$. The universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ is a (noncommutative) Hopf algebra on the same generators and relations, where $[x, y] = xy - yx$ for $x, y \in U(\mathfrak{g})$. The comultiplication of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is given on generators by

$$\Delta(x) = x \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes x$$

for $x \in \{e_i, f_i, h_i \mid i \in I\}$.

$\mathfrak{n}_+$ (respectively $\mathfrak{b}_-$) is the Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by all e_i (respectively h_i and f_i). We will assume henceforth that all $\mathfrak{n}_+$-modules are integrable. In other words, if M is an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module, we will assume that $\forall x \in M$, $i \in I$, $\exists n \geq 0$ such that $e_i^n(x) = 0$. Note that every $\mathfrak{g}$-module is also a $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module, so we are assuming these are "bounded above" as well. We do not assume the same for the action of f_i. For a $\mathfrak{g}$-module M, we designate $M^+ := \{m \in M \mid e_i(m) = 0\ \forall i \in I\}$, the set of "highest vectors". If A is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra, then A^+ is a subalgebra. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $i \in I$, we will use the notation $e_i^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n!} e_i^n$.

Suppose M is an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module algebra. For each $i \in I$ and $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$, set $\ell_i(x) = \max\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid e_i^\ell(x) \neq 0\}$ and $e_i^{(top)}(x) = e_i^{(\ell_i(x))}(x)$. Given $w \in W$ of length m, $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$, and $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$, we also use the shorthand

$$e_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(x) = e_{i_m}^{(top)} e_{i_{m-1}}^{(top)} \cdots e_{i_1}^{(top)}(x)$$

and define $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(x) = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ by the following:

$$a_k = \ell_{i_k}(e_{i_{k-1}}^{(top)} e_{i_{k-2}}^{(top)} \cdots e_{i_1}^{(top)}(x)).$$

Lastly, for $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \ldots, j_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, we set $e_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{j})} := e_{i_m}^{(j_m)} e_{i_{m-1}}^{(j_{m-1})} \cdots e_{i_1}^{(j_1)}$.

Definition 2.18. Let A be an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module algebra, $w \in W$, and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$. If $e_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(x) \in A^+$ for all $x \in A \setminus \{0\}$, then we say A is $\mathbf{i}$-*adapted*. We say a basis $\mathcal{B}$ for A is an $\mathbf{i}$-*adapted basis* if

(1) $e_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b) = 1$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}$.
(2) The restriction of $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ is an injective map $\mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, where m is the length of w.

If there exists any $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$ so that A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted, then we say more generally that A is *adapted*.

As in the quantum case, if A_0 possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis for some $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$ and is a "large enough" $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module subalgebra of A, then A is factorizable over A_0. The following theorem makes this precise.

Theorem 2.19. *Let A be an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module algebra. Given some $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$, let A_0 be an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module subalgebra of A possessing an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis $\mathcal{B}$. Denote by $\mu : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ the restriction of the multiplication of A to these $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module subalgebras inside A. Then*

(1) *μ is an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{n}_+$-modules.*
(2) *μ is an isomorphism if and only if A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$.*

Theorem 2.19 demonstrates a close relationship between being $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and being factorizable over an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module subalgebra possessing an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis. The following theorem explores this relationship from a different angle.

Theorem 2.20. *Let $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$ and suppose A is an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module algebra with an $\mathfrak{n}_+$-module subalgebra A_0. Then A is factorizable over A_0 if and only if A_0 possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$.*

The proofs of Theorems 2.19 and 2.20 are nearly identical to those of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 (respectively), so we do not replicate them here. We now restrict our focus to a specific $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra, $\mathbb{C}[U]$. Actually, $\mathbb{C}[U]$ is a specialization of $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ to $q = 1$. It is a (commutative) Poisson algebra with Poisson generators $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$, subject to the relations

$$\varepsilon(i, j, 1 - c_{i,j}) = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j,$$

where $\varepsilon(i, j, n)$ is defined inductively by $\varepsilon(i, j, 0) = x_j$, $\varepsilon(i, j, n + 1) = \{x_i, \varepsilon(i, j, n)\} - d_i(c_{i,j} + 2n)x_i\varepsilon(i, j, n)$. The $\mathfrak{g}$-module structure on $\mathbb{C}[U]$ is summarized in the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
h_i(x_j) &= -c_{i,j}x_j \quad \forall i, j \in I \\
h_i(\{x, y\}) &= \{h_i(x), y\} + \{x, h_i(y)\} \quad \forall i \in I,\ x, y \in \mathbb{C}[U] \\
e_i(x_j) &= \delta_{i,j} \quad \forall i, j \in I \\
e_i(\{x, y\}) &= \{e_i(x), y\} + \{x, e_i(y)\} + d_i e_i(x)h_i(y) - d_i h_i(x)e_i(y) \quad \forall i \in I,\ x, y \in \mathbb{C}[U] \\
f_i(x) &= \frac{1}{2d_i}\{x_i, x\} + \frac{1}{2}x_i h_i(x) \quad \forall i \in I,\ x \in \mathbb{C}[U].
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.21. Comparing the defining relations of $\mathbb{C}[U]$ with the action of f_i thereon, one sees that $f_i(x_i) = -x_i^2$ and $\varepsilon(i, j, n) = (2d_i)^n f_i^n(x_j)$, so that $f_i^{1-c_{i,j}}(x_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Observe also that $\{x_i, x\} = 2d_i f_i(x) - d_i x_i h_i(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{C}[U]$ and $i \in I$. It follows that $\mathbb{C}[U]$ is generated as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra by $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$.

It is known that $\mathbb{C}[U]$ possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis for every $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$ (in fact, this follows from the fact that $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ does). Combining this fact with Theorem 2.19 leads us to the following corollary.

Corollary 2.22. *Let A be a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra containing $\mathbb{C}[U]$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra. $\mu : A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U] \to A$ as in Theorem 2.19 is an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{n}_+$-modules if and only if there exists a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra A' which contains A as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra and is generated by $(A')^+$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra.*

The proof of the "if" part of Corollary 2.22 is very similar to the proof of Corollary 2.6 so we do not reproduce it here. The "only if" part will be a very easy consequence of the discussion at the end of Section 2.2, so we will address it there. Also, just as in the quantum setting, Corollary 2.22 leads to a proof of Theorem 1.1, which is nearly identical to that of Theorem 1.7, so we won't include it here. We do, however, note that instead of two families of quantities as arose in the proof of Corollary 2.6, only one arises in the proof of the "if" part of Corollary 2.22:

$$f_i(a) - h_i(a)x_i$$

where $i \in I$ and $a \in A'$. As in the quantum case, if $a \in A^+$, then $f_i(a) - h_i(a)x_i \in A^+$. Once again it is natural to ask what relations the family of operators $f_i - m_i h_i$ satisfies, where m_i denotes multiplication by x_i. Or to put it another way, do these operators indicate the action of a known algebra or Lie algebra which is somehow related to $\mathfrak{g}$? Again, we can answer in the affirmative, which the following theorem summarizes.

Theorem 2.23. *Let A be a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra containing $\mathbb{C}[U]$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra. Then A has another structure of a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra with action given by the formulas*

$$h_i \triangleright a = h_i(a), \quad f_i \triangleright a = f_i(a) - h_i(a)x_i.$$

In particular, the subalgebra A^+ is invariant under this $\mathfrak{b}_-$ action and is therefore a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module subalgebra.

Theorem 2.23 is proved in Section 3.10. As in the quantum case, Theorem 2.23 is in some sense a statement about the existence of a functor. To make this precise, we introduce a category whose objects bear properties similar to those found in Theorem 2.19.

Definition 2.24. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the category whose objects consist of pairs (A, φ_A), where

- A is an adapted $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra such that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U] \setminus \{0\})$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$;
- $\varphi_A : \mathbb{C}[U] \hookrightarrow A$ is an embedding of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras.

A morphism $(A, \varphi_A) \to (B, \varphi_B)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras $\psi : A \to B$ such that $\psi \circ \varphi_A = \varphi_B$.

Given a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras $\psi : A \to B$, it follows that $\psi(A^+) \subseteq B^+$, so $\psi|_{A^+}$ may be thought of as a map of $\mathbb{C}$-algebras $A^+ \to B^+$. If ψ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $(A, \varphi_A) \to (B, \varphi_B)$, then actually $\psi|_{A^+}$ is a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebras, where the $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module structure is the one given in Theorem 2.23. As a consequence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.25. *There is a functor $(-)^+ : \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathfrak{b}_- - \mathbf{ModAlg}$ (denoted $P \circ F$ in Section 1) which assigns to an object (A, φ_A) of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ its subalgebra of highest vectors A^+, equipped with the $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra structure of Theorem 2.23. $(-)^+$ is given on morphisms by restriction.*

Again, we hope for a quasi-inverse functor for $(-)^+$, but we must first state the following theorem.

Theorem 2.26. *If A is a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra, then $A \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ has the structure of a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra satisfying the following formulas:*

$$\begin{aligned}(1 \otimes x)(a \otimes 1) &= a \otimes x \\ h_i \rhd (a \otimes x) &= h_i(a) \otimes x + a \otimes h_i(x) \\ e_i \rhd (a \otimes x) &= a \otimes e_i(x) \\ f_i \rhd (a \otimes x) &= f_i(a) \otimes x + h_i(a) \otimes x_i x + a \otimes f_i(x).\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.26 will be proved in Section 3.10. The following corollary is almost immediate.

Corollary 2.27. *There is a functor $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U] : \mathfrak{b}_- - \mathbf{ModAlg} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ which assigns to a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra A, the pair $(A \otimes \mathbb{C}[U], 1 \otimes id)$, where $A \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ is given the $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra structure of Theorem 2.26. $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ is given on morphisms by $\psi \mapsto \psi \otimes id$.*

As promised, $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ is the desired quasi-inverse for $(-)^+$.

Theorem 2.28. *$(-)^+ : \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathfrak{b}_- - \mathbf{ModAlg}$ and $(-) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U] : \mathfrak{b}_- - \mathbf{ModAlg} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ are quasi-inverse equivalences of categories.*

The proof of Theorem 2.28 is very similar to that of 2.13, so we do not include it here. Now, it is well-known that if A and B are $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras, then so is $A \otimes B$. $A \otimes B$ has the naïve multiplication $(a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b') = aa' \otimes bb'$. So if (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) are objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, then $A \otimes B$ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra. Furthermore, it is obvious that $1 \otimes \varphi_B$ and $\varphi_A \otimes 1$ are injections $\mathbb{C}[U] \hookrightarrow A \otimes B$. However, it is not immediately obvious that $A \otimes B$ is adapted with $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \otimes B \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U] \setminus \{0\})\ \forall \mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$. Nevertheless, this is the case and the following proposition asserts as much and is proved in Section 3.11.

Proposition 2.29. *If (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) are objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, then $(A \otimes B, 1 \otimes \varphi_B)$ and $(A \otimes B, \varphi_A \otimes 1)$ are objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ as well.*

Theorem 2.28 and Proposition 2.29 allow us to define two "fusion" products on the category of $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebras, namely the following:

$$\begin{aligned}A * B &:= ((A \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]) \otimes (B \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]), 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathrm{id})^+ \\ A \star B &:= ((A \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]) \otimes (B \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]), 1 \otimes \mathrm{id} \otimes 1 \otimes 1)^+\end{aligned}$$

Unfortunately, as in the quantum case, the objects $(A \otimes B, 1 \otimes \varphi_B)$ and $(A \otimes B, \varphi_A \otimes 1)$ are not (necessarily at least) isomorphic, despite having equal underlying $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras. However, given $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebras

A and B, we of course have the natural $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra structure on $A \otimes B$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}(a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b') &= aa' \otimes bb' \\ h_i(a \otimes b) &= h_i(a) \otimes b + a \otimes h_i(b) \\ f_i(a \otimes b) &= f_i(a) \otimes b + a \otimes f_i(b)\end{aligned}$$

for $a, a' \in A$, $b, b' \in B$, and $i \in I$. This induces a more "symmetric" fusion product on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$:

$$(A, \varphi_A) \diamond (B, \varphi_B) := (((A, \varphi_A)^+ \otimes (B, \varphi_B)^+) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U], 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathrm{id}). \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 2.30. Since $\mathfrak{b}_-$-**ModAlg** is a monoidal category with unit object $\mathbb{C}$, the product $\diamond$ makes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ into a monoidal category with unit object $\mathbb{C}[U] = \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$. Given objects$(A, \varphi_A)$ and (B, φ_B) of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $(A, \varphi_A) \diamond (B, \varphi_B)$ is easily observed to be isomorphic to the quotient object

$$(A \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} B, \pi \circ (1 \otimes \varphi_B)) \cong (A \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} B, \pi \circ (\varphi_A \otimes 1))$$

where $A \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} B$ is the quotient of the $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra $A \otimes B$ by the ideal generated by all elements of the form $\varphi_A(x) \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \varphi_B(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{C}[U]$ and $\pi : A \otimes B \to A \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} B$ is the quotient map.

This natural structure also results in a very easy proof of the "only if" part of Corollary 2.22. Denote by $\mathbb{C}[T]$ the algebra with basis $\{v_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ (where $v_0 = 1$) and multiplication $v_\lambda v_\mu = v_{\lambda+\mu}$. We make it into a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra with $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module structure given by $h_i(v_\lambda) = (\alpha_i^\vee, \lambda)v_\lambda$ and $f_i(v_\lambda) = 0$. Suppose $\mu : A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U] \to A$ as in Theorem 2.19 is an isomorphism. We give A^+ the structure of a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra as in Theorem 2.23. Then Theorem 2.26 allows us to make $(A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[T]) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ into a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra. A is clearly a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra and

$$\begin{aligned}((1 \otimes v_{-\omega_i}) \otimes 1)\,[f_i \triangleright ((1 \otimes v_{\omega_i}) \otimes 1)] &= ((1 \otimes v_{-\omega_i}) \otimes 1)\,((1 \otimes h_i(v_{\omega_i})) \otimes x_i) \\ &= (\alpha_i^\vee, \omega_i)(1 \otimes v_{-\omega_i} v_{\omega_i} \otimes x_i) \\ &= 1 \otimes 1 \otimes x_i\end{aligned}$$

showing that $(A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[T]) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ is generated by $(A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[T]) \otimes \mathbb{C} = ((A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[T]) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U])^+$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra and proving the "only if" part of Corollary 2.22.

3. Proofs

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.3.** For $\mathbf{j} \in \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B})$, let $b_{\mathbf{j}}$ be the unique element of $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(b_{\mathbf{j}}) = \mathbf{j}$.

(1) We first observe that since A is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra and A^+ and A_0 are $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-submodules, μ is a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules. Hence we simply show that μ is injective. Now each nonzero element $a \in A^+ \otimes A_0$ can be written

$$a = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_{\mathbf{j}_k}$$

for some $n > 0$, $a_k \in A^+ \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{j}_k \in \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$. We may assume $\mathbf{j}_k < \mathbf{j}_l$ if $1 \le k < l \le n$ so that

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{j}_l}(b_{\mathbf{j}_k}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k < l \\ 1 & \text{if } k = \ell \end{cases}.$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\mu(a) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{j}_n)}(\mu(a)) \\ &= \mu\left(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{j}_n)}(a)\right) \\ &= \mu(a_n \otimes 1) \\ &= a_n\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $\mu(a) = 0$ if and only if $a = 0$, showing that μ is injective.

(2) ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose μ is an isomorphism. Given nonzero $a \in A$, write

$$a = \mu\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_{\mathbf{j}_k}\right)$$

as in (1). Then, since μ is injective, it is clear that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a) = \mathbf{j}_n = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(b_{\mathbf{j}_n})$, showing that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) \subseteq \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$. But since $A_0 \subseteq A$, it follows that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$. Also, as seen above

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) = E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{j}_n)}(a) = \mu(a_n \otimes 1) = a_n \in A^+,$$

so we see that A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted.
($\Leftarrow$) Suppose that A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$. By (1), we already know that μ is an injective $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-module homomorphism. Hence we simply use induction to show that μ is surjective. We first note that since A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted, if $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$, then $a = E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \in A^+$. In other words,

$$\{a \in A \setminus \{0\} \mid \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)\} = A^+ \setminus \{0\} \subset \mu(A^+ \otimes A_0).$$

Let $a \in A \setminus \{0\}$ and suppose $a' \in \mu(A^+ \otimes A_0)$ for all $a' \in A \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a') < \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)$. We have

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a))}(a - \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \otimes b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)})) = 0.$$

Hence either $a - \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \otimes b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)}) = 0$ or $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a - \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \otimes b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)})) < \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)$. In the former case, $a \in \mu(A^+ \otimes A_0)$. In the latter case, $a - \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \otimes b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)}) \in \mu(A^+ \otimes A_0)$ and so

$$a = (a - \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \otimes b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)})) + \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) \otimes b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)}) \in \mu(A^+ \otimes A_0).$$

So we have shown that $a \in \mu(A^+ \otimes A_0)$. By induction, μ is surjective. Hence μ is an isomorphism.

□

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.4.** ($\Leftarrow$) Suppose A_0 possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$. Then by Theorem 2.3, $\mu : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules.

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $\mu : A^+ \otimes A_0 \to A$ is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules. Hence we must have $(A_0)^+ = \mathbb{C}(q)$ or else μ would fail to be injective. Also, since A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted, A_0 is as well. Now for each $\mathbf{j} \in \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$ choose $b_{\mathbf{j}} \in A_0 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b_{\mathbf{j}}) = 1$ and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(b_{\mathbf{j}}) = \mathbf{j}$ (note that $b_{(0,\cdots,0)} = 1$). We claim that $\mathcal{B} = \{b_{\mathbf{j}} \mid \mathbf{j} \in \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})\}$ is an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis for A_0. To prove that $\mathcal{B}$ is linearly independent and spans A_0, we mimic the proofs that μ is injective and surjective (respectively) in Theorem 2.3. Suppose

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_k b_{\mathbf{j}_k} = 0$$

for some $r_k \in \mathbb{C}(q)$ and $\mathbf{j}_k \in \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$ such that $\mathbf{j}_k < \mathbf{j}_l$ if $k < l$. Then

$$0 = E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{j}_n)}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_k b_{\mathbf{j}_k}\right) = r_n.$$

By induction, each $r_k = 0$. It follows that $\mathcal{B}$ is linearly independent. Note that

$$\{a \in A_0 \setminus \{0\} \mid \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)\} = (A_0)^+ \setminus \{0\} = \mathbb{C}(q)^\times \subseteq \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Let $a \in A_0 \setminus \{0\}$ and suppose $a' \in \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(\mathcal{B})$ for all $a' \in A_0 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a') < \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)$. We have

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a))}(a - E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)}) = 0.$$

Hence either $a - E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)} = 0$ or $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a - E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)}) < \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)$. In the former case $a \in \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(\mathcal{B})$. In the latter case $a - E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)} \in \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(\mathcal{B})$ and so

$$a = (a - E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)}) + E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(a) b_{\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(a)} \in \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(\mathcal{B}).$$

So we have shown that $a \in \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(\mathcal{B})$. By induction, $\mathcal{B}$ spans A_0. Hence we have shown that $\mathcal{B}$ is a basis for A_0. By construction, it is in fact an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis for A_0.

In light of $\mathcal{B}$'s existence, a typical element of A is of the form

$$\mu\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_{\mathbf{j}_k}\right)$$

for some $a_k \in A^+$ and $\mathbf{j}_k \in \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\})$. It is now clear that

$$\nu_{\mathbf{i}}\left(\mu\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_{\mathbf{j}_k}\right)\right) = \max\{\mathbf{j}_k \mid k = 1, \ldots, n\}$$

so that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\}) \supseteq \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$. Since $A_0 \subseteq A$, we have $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\}) \subseteq \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$ and so $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A_0 \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$. □

3.3. **Proof of Proposition 2.5.** We have already observed that for any $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$, the restriction of $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{dual}$ is an injective map $\mathcal{B}^{dual} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, where m is the length of w_0. Hence it suffices to show that $E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$. To do this we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Given $w \in W$ and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' \in R(w)$, $E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b) = E_{\mathbf{i}'}^{(top)}(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$.*

Proof: It is well-known that any two reduced words for a fixed $w \in W$ are related by a series of rank two relations. Hence it suffices to show the lemma when $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{i}'$ differ by a single rank two relation. But it is also well-known that $E_j^{(top)}$ preserves $\mathcal{B}^{dual}$ for all $j \in I$ and for any $\mathbf{j} \in R(w)$, the operator $E_{\mathbf{j}}^{(top)}$ is by definition just the composition of operators $E_{j_\ell}^{(top)} \cdots E_{j_2}^{(top)} E_{j_1}^{(top)}$, where ℓ is the length of w. This reduces the problem to the case when w is the longest element of a rank two parabolic subgroup of W. We will therefore assume for the rest of the proof that $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{i}'$ include only the letters $i_1, i_2 \in I$ and are the two distinct reduced words for the longest element of a rank two parabolic subgroup of W.

Now $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ factors as the product of two subalgebras: $\mathbb{C}_q[U] = (\mathbb{C}_q[U]_{>w})(\mathbb{C}_q[U]_{\leq w})$ (see [3], for example, where they are respectively denoted $\mathbf{U}_q^-(> w, -1)$ and $\mathbf{U}_q^-(\leq w, -1)$). It is known that

$$E_{i_1}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]_{>w}) = E_{i_2}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]_{>w}) = 0$$

and

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]_{\leq w} \cap \mathcal{B}^{dual}) = E_{\mathbf{i}'}^{(top)}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]_{\leq w} \cap \mathcal{B}^{dual}) = 1.$$

According to ([3], Theorem 3.14), for each $b \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$, there exist $b' \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]_{>w} \cap \mathcal{B}^{dual}$, $b'' \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]_{\leq w} \cap \mathcal{B}^{dual}$, and $\xi \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ such that $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\xi) < \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$, $\nu_{\mathbf{i}'}(\xi) < \nu_{\mathbf{i}'}(b)$, and

$$b'b'' = b + \xi.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b) &= E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b + \xi) \\ &= E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b'b'') \\ &= b' E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b'') \\ &= b'. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, $E_{\mathbf{i}'}^{(top)}(b) = b'$, so the lemma is proved. □

In light of Lemma 3.1, given $w \in W$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$, we may unambiguously define $E_w^{(top)}(b) := E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}(b)$ for any $\mathbf{i} \in R(w)$. Now given $j \in I$, there exists some $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$ such that if $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_m)$, then $i_m = j$. It follows that $E_j(E_{w_0}^{(top)}(b)) = 0$ for all $j \in I$, i.e. $E_{w_0}^{(top)}(b) \in (\mathbb{C}_q[U])^+ = \mathbb{C}(q)$. Since $E_j^{(top)}(b) \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$ for all $j \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$, it follows that $E_{w_0}^{(top)}(b) = 1$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}^{dual}$. □

3.4. **Proof of Corollary 2.6.** Let $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$. As previously remarked, $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ possesses an $\mathbf{i}$-adapted basis. Then Theorem 2.3 (1) says that $\mu' : (A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U] \to A'$ is an injective homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-modules.

We now show that $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module subalgebra of A' and hence is equal to A' by the assumption that $(A')^+$ generates A'. To see that $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ is a subalgebra of A', it suffices to show that $x_i a \in \mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ for $i \in I$ and $a \in (A')^+$. For this, we observe that

$$E_i(x_j a - K_j(a)x_j) = \delta_{ij}K_i(a) - \delta_{ij}K_j(a) = 0$$

and hence $x_j a - K_j(a)x_j \in (A')^+$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_i a &= K_i(a)x_i + (x_i a - K_i(a)x_i) \\ &= \mu'(K_i(a) \otimes x_i + (x_i a - K_i(a)x_i) \otimes 1) \\ &\in \mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]). \end{aligned}$$

So $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ is a subalgebra of A'.

Now we need to show that $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ is closed under the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. By Theorem 2.3 (1), μ' is $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$-invariant and hence it suffices to show that $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ is closed under the action of F_i for $i \in I$. Observe that for $a \in (A')^+$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$, $\mu'(a \otimes x) = ax$, so we will simply compute the action of F_i on such an element. However, before doing so, we note that for $a \in (A')^+$ and $i, j \in I$, we have

$$E_i\left(F_j(a) + x_j\frac{K_j^{-2}(a) - a}{q_j - q_j^{-1}}\right) = \delta_{ij}\frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} + \delta_{ij}\frac{K_i^{-1}(a) - K_i(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} = 0,$$

showing that $F_j(a) + x_j\dfrac{K_j^{-2}(a) - a}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \in (A')^+$. Now we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(ax) &= F_i(a)x + K_i^{-1}(a)F_i(x) \\ &= \left(F_i(a) + x_i\frac{K_i^{-2}(a) - a}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\right)x - x_i\frac{K_i^{-2}(a) - a}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}x + K_i^{-1}(a)F_i(x) \\ &= \mu'\left(\left(F_i(a) + x_i\frac{K_i^{-2}(a) - a}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\right) \otimes x + K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes F_i(x)\right) - \mu'(1 \otimes x_i)\mu'\left(\frac{K_i^{-2}(a) - a}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \otimes x\right) \\ &\in \mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]). \end{aligned}$$

So $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])$ is closed under the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and we may conclude that $\mu'((A')^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]) = A'$. Hence μ' is an isomorphism. By Theorem 2.3 (2), this implies that A' is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A' \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]\setminus\{0\})$. We deduce that A is $\mathbf{i}$-adapted and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]\setminus\{0\}) \subseteq \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A\setminus\{0\}) \subseteq \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A'\setminus\{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]\setminus\{0\})$, i.e. $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U] \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \setminus \{0\})$. Hence applying Theorem 2.3 (2) again, μ is an isomorphism. □

3.5. **Proof of Theorem 1.7.** We first recall that $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebra and is isomorphic (as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module) to the direct sum of all simple finite dimensional $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules. For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, let v_λ be a nonzero highest weight vector in the simple finite-dimensional $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V_\lambda \subset \mathbb{C}_q[G/U]$, which are of chosen such that for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$, $v_\lambda v_\mu = v_{\lambda+\mu}$ (where, of course, $v_0 = 1$). Before showing the factorizability of $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]$ after localization, we recall the definition of right Ore sets (which allow for Ore localizations and are sometimes also called right denominator sets) for the reader's convenience.

Definition 3.2. Let R be any (unital) ring. A multiplicative subset $S \subset R$ containing 1 is called a *right Ore set* if the following conditions are satisfied for $r \in R$ and $s \in S$:

(1) $rS \cap sR \neq \varnothing$.
(2) If $sr = 0$, then $\exists s' \in S$ such that $rs' = 0$.

We will say S is a *special right Ore set* if the following (stronger) conditions are satisfied:

(1) $sR = Rs$ for $s \in S$.
(2) S does not contain any zero-divisors.

It is well-known that $S = \{v_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^+\} \subset \mathbb{C}_q[G/U]$ is a special right Ore set and the Ore localization $(\mathbb{C}_q[G/U])[S^{-1}]$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}_q[B^-]$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. The following lemmas allow us to create special right Ore sets in the n-fold braided tensor product $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes} n}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\Bbbk$ be any field and suppose A and B are $\Bbbk$-algebras such that the $\Bbbk$-vector space $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$ has the structure of a $\Bbbk$-algebra satisfying*

$$(a \otimes 1)(a' \otimes b') = aa' \otimes b'$$
$$(a \otimes b)(1 \otimes b') = a \otimes bb'$$

for $a, a' \in A$ and $b, b' \in B$. If S is a special right Ore set in B such that

$$(1 \otimes s)((A \setminus \{0\}) \otimes 1) = ((A \setminus \{0\}) \otimes 1)(1 \otimes s)$$

for $s \in S$, then $1 \otimes S := \{1 \otimes s \mid s \in S\}$ is a special right Ore set in $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$.

Proof: It is clear that $1 \otimes S$ is a multiplicative set containing $1 \otimes 1$ and that $(1 \otimes s)(A \otimes_\Bbbk B) = (A \otimes_\Bbbk B)(1 \otimes s)$ for $s \in S$, so we simply show that $1 \otimes S$ does not contain any zero-divisors. Fix $s \in S$. Now an arbitrary nonzero element $x \in A \otimes_\Bbbk B$ can be written in the form

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_k$$

for some $a_k \in A \setminus \{0\}$ and $b_k \in B \setminus \{0\}$. We may assume that $\{b_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is a linearly independent set. Since s is not a zero-divisor in B, it follows that $\{sb_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is a linearly independent set, as is $\{b_k s\}_{k=1}^n$. Also, by assumption, for each $k = 1, \ldots, n$, there exists $a_k' \in A \setminus \{0\}$ such that $(1 \otimes s)(a_k \otimes 1) = a_k' \otimes s$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(1 \otimes s)x &= (1 \otimes s)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_k\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k' \otimes sb_k \neq 0,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}x(1 \otimes s) &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_k\right)(1 \otimes s) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \otimes b_k s \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since x was an arbitrary element of $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$, we have shown that $1 \otimes s$ is not a zero-divisor in $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Let A and B be $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebras and let S be a special right Ore set in B consisting of highest weight vectors. Then $1 \otimes S$ is a special right Ore set in the braided tensor product $A \underline{\otimes} B$.*

Proof: In light of Lemma 3.3, it suffices to show that $(1 \otimes s)((A \setminus \{0\}) \otimes 1) = ((A \setminus \{0\}) \otimes 1)(1 \otimes s)$ for $s \in S$. Since S consists of highest weight vectors in B, we have the commutation relation

$$(1 \otimes s)(a \otimes 1) = q^{\sum_{i,j} d_i (C^{-1})_{i,j} (\alpha_i^\vee, |s|)(\alpha_j^\vee, |a|)} a \otimes s$$

for weight vectors $a \in A$ and $s \in S$ of weight $|a|$ and $|s|$, respectively. Let us denote $q_{s,a} := q^{\sum_{i,j} d_i (C^{-1})_{i,j} (\alpha_i^\vee, |s|)(\alpha_j^\vee, |a|)}$ for short. Now an arbitrary nonzero element $a \in A \setminus \{0\}$ is of the form

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k$$

where each $a_k \in A \setminus \{0\}$ is a weight vector. We may assume $|a_k| \neq |a_l|$ if $k \neq l$. Then for $s \in S$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} q_{s,a_k} a_k \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n} q_{s,a_k}^{-1} a_k \neq 0.$$

Therefore since

$$(1\otimes s)\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}a_k\right)\otimes 1\right)=\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}q_{s,a_k}a_k\right)\otimes 1\right)(1\otimes s)\quad\text{ and}$$
$$\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}a_k\right)\otimes 1\right)(1\otimes s)=(1\otimes s)\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}q_{s,a_k}^{-1}a_k\right)\otimes 1\right),$$

it follows that $(1\otimes s)((A\setminus\{0\})\otimes 1)=((A\setminus\{0\})\otimes 1)(1\otimes s)$ for $s\in S$ and so the lemma is proven. □

By Lemma 3.4 and induction, $S':=1\otimes\cdots\otimes 1\otimes S$ is a special right Ore set in $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes} n}$. Furthermore, it is clear that

$$\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes} n}[S'^{-1}]\cong\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes}(n-1)}\underline{\otimes}\mathbb{C}_q[B^-]$$

as $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras and $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes}(n-1)}\underline{\otimes}\mathbb{C}_q[B^-]$ is generated by $(\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes}(n-1)}\underline{\otimes}\mathbb{C}_q[B^-])^+$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra. We now have an embedding of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras

$$\mathbb{C}_q[U]\hookrightarrow\mathbb{C}_q[B^-]\subset\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes}(n-1)}\underline{\otimes}\mathbb{C}_q[B^-].$$

Then by Corollary 2.6, $\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes}(n-1)}\underline{\otimes}\mathbb{C}_q[B^-]\cong(\mathbb{C}_q[G/U]^{\underline{\otimes} n})[S'^{-1}]$ is factorizable over $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$. □

3.6. **Proofs of Theorems 2.8 and 2.11.** We begin this section with some results that will play key roles in the proofs of the theorems. Let H be a Hopf algebra such that H^{cop} is a Hopf algebra as well (e.g. $H=\mathcal{K}$).

Theorem 3.5. *Let A be a left H-module algebra and suppose $V\in{}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$ is such that the Nichols algebra $\mathcal{B}(V)$ is a left H-module subalgebra of A, where ${}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$ is the category of left-left Yetter-Drinfeld modules over H. Then A can be given a left $\mathcal{B}(V)$-module structure via*

$$v\triangleright a=va-(v^{(-1)}\triangleright a)v^{(0)}.$$

Proof: Consider the Hopf algebra $\widetilde{H}:=\mathcal{B}(V)\rtimes H$, where $\Delta(u)=\underline{u}_{(1)}(\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)}\otimes(\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)}$ and $S(u)=S(u^{(-1)})\underline{S}(u^{(0)})$ for $u\in\mathcal{B}(V)$. Then $\widetilde{H}$ can naturally be considered as a subalgebra of $\widetilde{A}:=A\rtimes H$. Hence $\widetilde{A}$ is an $\widetilde{H}$-module algebra under the adjoint action:

$$\widetilde{h}\triangleright\widetilde{a}=\widetilde{h}_{(1)}\widetilde{a}S(\widetilde{h}_{(2)}).$$

We observe that A is preserved under the restriction of this action to $\mathcal{B}(V)$ (note that for convenience we will write, e.g., a instead of $a\otimes 1$):

$$\begin{aligned}u\triangleright a&=u_{(1)}aS(u_{(2)})\\&=\underline{u}_{(1)}(\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)}aS(((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)})^{(-1)})\underline{S}(((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)})^{(0)})\\&=\underline{u}_{(1)}(\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-2)}aS((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)})\underline{S}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)})\\&=\underline{u}_{(1)}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-3)}\triangleright a)(\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-2)}S((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)})\underline{S}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)})\\&=\underline{u}_{(1)}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-2)}\triangleright a)\varepsilon((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)})\underline{S}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)})\\&=\underline{u}_{(1)}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)}\triangleright a)\underline{S}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)})\in A\end{aligned}$$

for $u\in\mathcal{B}(V)$ and $a\in A$. In fact, it is clear that A has become a left $\widetilde{H}$-module algebra. □

Of course, Theorem 3.5 has a natural counterpart with "left" replaced by "right".

Theorem 3.6. *Let A be a right H-module algebra and suppose $V\in\mathcal{YD}^H_H$ is such that the Nichols algebra $\mathcal{B}(V)$ is a right H-module subalgebra of A. Then A can be given a right $\mathcal{B}(V)$-module structure via*

$$a\blacktriangleleft v=av-v^{(0)}(a\blacktriangleleft v^{(1)}).$$

Corollary 3.7. *In the assumptions of Theorem 3.6, if H is commutative, then A can be given a left $\mathcal{B}(V)^{op}$-module structure via*

$$v\blacktriangleright a=av-v^{(0)}(v^{(1)}\blacktriangleright a).$$

Remark 3.8. If A is a $(\mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes H)$-module algebra (e.g. Theorem 3.5), then we can form the *braided cross product* $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ which, as a vector space, is just $A \otimes \mathcal{B}(V) \subset A \rtimes (\mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes H)$ and it is a subalgebra. Furthermore, it is an H-module algebra. We note that if A is additionally a $\mathcal{B}(V)$-module algebra in ${}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$, then our definition of $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ matches that of $A \rtimes \mathcal{B}(V)$. However, we don't require this latter condition, which why we use a different notation. Similarly, we can form the braided tensor product $A\underline{\otimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ (which is an H-module algebra) even if A is an H-module algebra and is not in ${}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$, simply satisfying $(1\otimes v)(a\otimes 1) = (v^{(-1)} \triangleright a)\otimes v^{(0)}$. This corresponds to the braided cross product $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$, where $\mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes H$ acts on A by the "trivial" action:

$$(u \otimes h) \triangleright a = \underline{\varepsilon}(u)h \triangleright a \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{B}(V),\ h \in H,\ a \in A.$$

Theorem 3.9. *Let $V \in {}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$ and suppose A is an H-module algebra containing $\mathcal{B}(V)$ as an H-module subalgebra. Then the linear map $\tau := (\mu_A \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \iota \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \underline{\Delta}) : A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V) \to A\underline{\otimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ is an H-module algebra isomorphism with inverse $\tau^{-1} = (\mu_A \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \iota \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \underline{S} \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \underline{\Delta})$, where $\iota : \mathcal{B}(V) \to A$ is the inclusion and the implied $\mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes H$ action on A is that of Theorem 3.5.*

Proof: We first verify that τ and τ^{-1} are truly mutually inverse (and hence that we are justified in using the name τ^{-1}). For $a \in A$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(V)$, we directly compute

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tau \circ \tau^{-1})(a \otimes b) &= \tau(a\underline{S}(\underline{b}_{(1)}) \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)}) \\
&= aS(\underline{b}_{(1)})\underline{b}_{(2)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(3)} \\
&= a\underline{\varepsilon}(\underline{b}_{(1)}) \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= a \otimes \underline{\varepsilon}(\underline{b}_{(1)})\underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= a \otimes b
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tau^{-1} \circ \tau)(a \otimes b) &= \tau^{-1}(a\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)}) \\
&= a\underline{b}_{(1)}\underline{S}(\underline{b}_{(2)}) \otimes \underline{b}_{(3)} \\
&= a\underline{\varepsilon}(\underline{b}_{(1)}) \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= a \otimes \underline{\varepsilon}(\underline{b}_{(1)})\underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= a \otimes b.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau \circ \tau^{-1}$ and $\tau^{-1} \circ \tau$ act as the identity on pure tensors, they are both the identity homomorphism. Hence τ and τ^{-1} are mutually inverse. We conclude by verifying that τ is actually a homomorphism of algebras (and hence that τ^{-1} is as well). For $v \in V$, $a, a' \in A$, and $b \in \mathcal{B}(V)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(a \otimes v)\tau(a' \otimes b) &= (av \otimes 1 + a \otimes v)(a'\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)}) \\
&= ava'\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} + a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright (a'\underline{b}_{(1)})) \otimes v^{(0)}\underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= ava'\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} + a(v^{(-2)} \triangleright a')(v^{(-1)} \triangleright \underline{b}_{(1)}) \otimes v^{(0)}\underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= ava'\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} - a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright a')v^{(0)}\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} + a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright a')v^{(0)}\underline{b}_{(1)} \otimes \underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&\quad + a(v^{(-2)} \triangleright a')(v^{(1)} \triangleright \underline{b}_{(1)}) \otimes v^{(0)}\underline{b}_{(2)} \\
&= \tau(ava' \otimes b - a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright a')v^{(0)} \otimes b + a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes v^{(0)}b) \\
&= \tau(a(va' - (v^{(-1)} \triangleright a')v^{(0)}) \otimes b + a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes v^{(0)}b) \\
&= \tau(a(v \triangleright a') \otimes b + a(v^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes v^{(0)}b) \\
&= \tau((a \otimes v)(a' \otimes b)).
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\{b \in \mathcal{B}(V) \mid \tau(a \otimes b)\tau(a' \otimes b') = \tau((a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b'))\ \forall a, a' \in A, b' \in \mathcal{B}(V)\}$ is a subalgebra of $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$. We have shown it contains V, so it must be equal to $\mathcal{B}(V)$. Now, since pure tensors span $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ and τ is a linear map, it follows that τ respects multiplication. The theorem is proved. $\square$

Corollary 3.10. *Let $V \in {}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$. Then there are (injective) H-module algebra homomorphisms $\mathcal{B}(V) \to \mathcal{B}(V)\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ and $\mathcal{B}(V) \to \mathcal{B}(V)\underline{\otimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ given by $v \mapsto 1 \otimes v - v \otimes 1$ and $v \mapsto 1 \otimes v + v \otimes 1$, respectively, for $v \in V$.*

Proof: Let τ be as in Theorem 3.9, where $A = \mathcal{B}(V)$. Restrict τ^{-1} to $\mathcal{B}(V) \cong 1\underline{\otimes}\mathcal{B}(V) \subset \mathcal{B}(V)\underline{\otimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ and observe that $\tau^{-1}(1 \otimes v) = 1 \otimes v - v \otimes 1$ for $v \in V$.

Similarly, restrict τ to $\mathcal{B}(V) \cong 1\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V) \subset \mathcal{B}(V)\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ and observe that $\tau(1 \otimes v) = 1 \otimes v + v \otimes 1$ for $v \in V$. □

Theorem 3.11. *Let $V \in {}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$ and set $\widetilde{H} = \mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes H$. Let A be a left $\widetilde{H}$-module algebra and suppose A contains an $\widetilde{H}$-module subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V)$ with the "adjoint" action:*

$$(u \otimes h) \rhd u' = \underline{u}_{(1)}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(-1)}h \rhd u')\underline{S}((\underline{u}_{(2)})^{(0)}) \quad \text{for } u, u' \in \mathcal{B}(V),\ h \in H.$$

Then there is a left $\mathcal{B}(V)$ action $\blacktriangleright$ on A given by

$$v \blacktriangleright a = (v \rhd a) - [va - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a)v^{(0)}] \quad \text{for } v \in V,\ a \in A.$$

Proof: We first observe that $\mathcal{B}(V)\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ is an H-module subalgebra of $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$. By Corollary 3.10, the elements $1 \otimes v - v \otimes 1 \in A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ $(v \in V)$ generate an H-module algebra isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V)$. Then by Theorem 3.5, we can define an action of $\mathcal{B}(V)$ on $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ by

$$v \cdot (a \otimes u) = (1 \otimes v - v \otimes 1)(a \otimes u) - [v^{(-1)} \rhd (a \otimes u)](1 \otimes v^{(0)} - v^{(0)} \otimes 1).$$

Now we need only observe that this action preserves $A = A\underline{\rtimes}1 \subset A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ and acts in the prescribed manner:

$$\begin{aligned} v \cdot (a \otimes 1) &= (1 \otimes v - v \otimes 1)(a \otimes 1) - [v^{(-1)} \rhd (a \otimes 1)](1 \otimes v^{(0)} - v^{(0)} \otimes 1) \\ &= (v \rhd a) \otimes 1 + (v^{(-1)} \rhd a) \otimes v^{(0)} - va \otimes 1 - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a) \otimes v^{(0)} + (v^{(-1)} \rhd a)v^{(0)} \otimes 1 \\ &= [(v \rhd a) - [va - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a)v^{(0)}]] \otimes 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.12. *Let $V \in {}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$ and set $\widetilde{H} = \mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes H$. Let A be a left $\widetilde{H}$-module algebra and suppose A contains an $\widetilde{H}$-module subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V)$ with the trivial action:*

$$(u \otimes h) \rhd u' = \underline{\varepsilon}(u)h \rhd u' \quad \text{for } u, u' \in \mathcal{B}(V),\ h \in H.$$

Then there is a left $\mathcal{B}(V)$ action $\blacktriangleright$ on A given by

$$v \blacktriangleright a = (v \rhd a) + [va - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a)v^{(0)}] \quad \text{for } v \in V,\ a \in A.$$

Proof: By Corollary 3.10, the elements $1 \otimes v + v \otimes 1 \in A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ $(v \in V)$ generate an H-module algebra isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V)$. Then by Theorem 3.5, we can define an action of $\mathcal{B}(V)$ on $A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ by

$$v \cdot (a \otimes u) = (1 \otimes v + v \otimes 1)(a \otimes u) - [v^{(-1)} \rhd (a \otimes u)](1 \otimes v^{(0)} + v^{(0)} \otimes 1).$$

Now we need only observe that this action preserves $A = A\underline{\rtimes}1 \subset A\underline{\rtimes}\mathcal{B}(V)$ and acts in the prescribed manner:

$$\begin{aligned} v \cdot (a \otimes 1) &= (1 \otimes v + v \otimes 1)(a \otimes 1) - [v^{(-1)} \rhd (a \otimes 1)](1 \otimes v^{(0)} + v^{(0)} \otimes 1) \\ &= (v \rhd a) \otimes 1 + (v^{(-1)} \rhd a) \otimes v^{(0)} + va \otimes 1 - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a) \otimes v^{(0)} - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a)v^{(0)} \otimes 1 \\ &= [(v \rhd a) + [va - (v^{(-1)} \rhd a)v^{(0)}]] \otimes 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.13. *Let $\hat{A}$ be a left H-module algebra and suppose that $V_1 \in {}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$ and $V_2 \in {}_H\mathcal{YD}^H$ are H-submodules of $\hat{A}$. For $v_i \in V_i$, define the following actions on $\hat{A}$:*

$$v_1 \rhd a = v_1 a - v_1^{(-1)}(a)v_1^{(0)} \qquad v_2 \blacktriangleright a = v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(a) - av_2.$$

If (1) $v_1 \rhd v_2 = v_2 \blacktriangleright v_1 = 0$ and (2) $v_1^{(-2)}(v_2^{(0)})v_1^{(-1)}(v_2^{(1)}(a))v_1^{(0)} = v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(v_1^{(-1)}(a))v_2^{(2)}(v_1^{(0)})$ for all $v_i \in V_i$ and $a \in \hat{A}$, then $v_1 \rhd (v_2 \blacktriangleright a) = v_2 \blacktriangleright (v_1 \rhd a)$ for $v_i \in V_i$ and $a \in \hat{A}$.

Proof: We first note that if $v_1 \triangleright v_2 = v_2 \blacktriangleright v_1 = 0$, then $v_1 v_2 = v_1^{(-1)}(v_2)v_1^{(0)} = v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(v_1)$ and for $a, b \in A$, we have

$$v_1 \triangleright (ab) = (v_1 \triangleright a)b + v_1^{(-1)}(a)(v_1^{(0)} \triangleright b); \quad v_2 \blacktriangleright (ab) = (v_2^{(0)} \blacktriangleright a)v_2^{(1)}(b) + a(v_2 \triangleright b).$$

Now we simply compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_1 \triangleright (v_2 \blacktriangleright a) &= v_1 \triangleright (v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(a) - av_2) \\
&= (v_1 \triangleright v_2^{(0)})v_2^{(1)}(a) + v_1^{(-1)}(v_2^{(0)})(v_1^{(0)} \triangleright v_2^{(1)}(a)) - (v_1 \triangleright a)v_2 - v_1^{(-1)}(a)(v_1^{(0)} \triangleright v_2) \\
&= v_1^{(-1)}(v_2^{(0)})(v_1^{(0)} \triangleright v_2^{(1)}(a)) - (v_1 \triangleright a)v_2 \\
&= v_1^{(-1)}(v_2^{(0)})(v_1^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(a) - (v_1^{(0)})^{(-1)}(v_2^{(1)}(a))(v_1^{(0)})^{(0)}) - (v_1 a - v_1^{(-1)}(a)v_1^{(0)})v_2 \\
&= v_1^{(-1)}(v_2^{(0)})v_1^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(a) - v_1^{(-2)}(v_2^{(0)})v_1^{(-1)}(v_2^{(1)}(a))v_1^{(0)} - v_1 a v_2 + v_1^{(-1)}(a)v_1^{(0)}v_2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_2 \blacktriangleright (v_1 \triangleright a) &= v_2 \blacktriangleright (v_1 a - v_1^{(-1)}(a)v_1^{(0)}) \\
&= (v_2^{(0)} \blacktriangleright v_1)v_2^{(1)}(a) + v_1(v_2 \blacktriangleright a) - (v_2^{(0)} \blacktriangleright v_1^{(-1)}(a))v_2^{(1)}(v_1^{(0)} + v_1^{(-1)}(a)(v_2 \triangleright v_1^{(0)} \\
&= v_1(v_2 \blacktriangleright a) - (v_2^{(0)} \blacktriangleright v_1^{(-1)}(a))v_2^{(1)}(v_1^{(0)}) \\
&= v_1(v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(a) - av_2) - ((v_2^{(0)})^{(0)}(v_2^{(0)})^{(1)}(v_1^{(-1)}(a)) - v_1^{(-1)}(a)v_2^{(0)})v_2^{(1)}(v_1^{(0)}) \\
&= v_1 v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(a) - v_1 a v_2 - v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(v_1^{(-1)}(a))v_2^{(2)}(v_1^{(0)}) + v_1^{(-1)}(a)v_2^{(0)}v_2^{(1)}(v_1^{(0)})
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing terms, we see that the two quantities are indeed equal. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8

Let $V = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}\{F_i \mid i \in I\} \subset U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$. Then $V \in {}^{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{YD}$ with structure given by

$$K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright F_j = q_i^{\mp c_{i,j}} F_j; \quad \delta_L(F_i) = K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i.$$

Let $V' = V$ as a vector space, but $V' \in {}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{YD}^{\mathcal{K}}$ with structure given by

$$K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright F_j = q_i^{\mp c_{i,j}} F_j; \quad \delta_R(F_i) = F_i \otimes K_i^{-1}.$$

Note that we can also consider V' as an object of $\mathcal{YD}^{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ since $\mathcal{K}$ is commutative. It is well-known (see, for example, [4]) that the corresponding Nichols algebras are isomorphic to $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-)$ as $\mathcal{K}$-module algebras in the obvious way (i.e. $F_i \mapsto F_i$).

By assumption, $\mathbb{C}_q[U] \subset A$, so there is a natural embedding of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$-module algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-) \hookrightarrow A$ given by $F_i \mapsto \frac{x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$. Theorems 3.5 and 3.11 then imply that there is a $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-)$ action on A given by

$$F_i \triangleright a = F_i(a) - \frac{x_i a - K_i^{-1}(a)x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}},$$

matching the proposed action of $F_{i,1}$.

Now utilizing a slightly different embedding $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-) \hookrightarrow A$, $F_i \mapsto -\frac{x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$, Corollary 3.7 gives another action of $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-) \cong U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-)^{op}$ on A:

$$F_i \triangleright a = \frac{x_i K_i^{-1}(a) - a x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}},$$

matching the proposed action of $F_{i,2}$.

It is easily observed that we have made A into both a $\mathcal{B}(V) \rtimes \mathcal{K}$-module algebra and a $\mathcal{B}(V') \rtimes \mathcal{K}$-module algebra.

We now wish to show that the operators $F_{i,1}$ and $F_{j,2}$ commute. To do so, we construct the braided cross product $\hat{A} := A \underline{\rtimes} U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-)$, where the F_i act as $F_{i,1}$. As above, we define "clever" embeddings of V and V' into $\hat{A}$, namely $F_i \mapsto \frac{x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \otimes 1$ and $F_i \mapsto 1 \otimes F_i$, respectively. It is easily checked that the hypotheses of Theorem

3.13 are satisfied. Furthermore, the actions defined in Theorem 3.13 preserve A and match the actions of $F_{i,1}$ and $F_{j,2}$ on A, showing that the prescribed actions of $F_{i,1}$ and $F_{j,2}$ do, in fact, commute. □

In light of Theorem 2.8, $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra with action given by

$$K_i^{\pm 1} \rhd x_j = q_i^{\mp c_{i,j}} x_j; \quad F_{i,1} \rhd x_j = 0; \quad F_{i,2} \rhd x_j = \frac{q_i^{c_{i,j}} x_i x_j - x_j x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}.$$

We make $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ into a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-comodule algebra via the algebra homomorphism $\delta : \mathbb{C}_q[U] \to U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ given on generators by

$$\delta(x_i) = K_i \otimes x_i + (q_i - q_i^{-1}) F_{i,2} K_i \otimes 1.$$

The fact that this gives a well-defined algebra homomorphism follows immediately from the following lemma, which can be deduced from the fact that in ([4], 1.2.6), $r : \mathbf{f} \to \mathbf{f} \otimes \mathbf{f}$, $\theta_i \mapsto \theta_i \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \theta_i$ is well-defined.

Lemma 3.14. *Let R be any $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra and suppose $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}, \{z_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq R$ are two families of elements satisfying the quantum Serre relations. If*

$$z_j y_i = q_i^{c_{i,j}} y_i z_j \quad \text{for } i, j \in I$$

then $\{y_i + z_i\}_{i \in I}$ also satisfies the quantum Serre relations.

It is easily checked that $(\mathrm{id} \otimes \delta) \circ \delta = (\Delta \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \delta$ and $(\epsilon \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \delta = \mathrm{id}$.

Proposition 3.15. *The above action and coaction make $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ into an algebra in the category ${}^{U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)}\mathcal{YD}$ of left-left Yetter-Drinfeld modules over $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$.*

Proof: We need only verify that the compatibility condition is satisfied, i.e. that

$$h_{(1)} x^{(-1)} \otimes (h_{(2)} \rhd x^{(0)}) = (h_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(-1)} h_{(2)} \otimes (h_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(0)} \tag{3.1}$$

for $h \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$. It is easily checked that (3.1) is satisfied for $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$ and $x \in \{x_i \mid i \in I\}$. Suppose (3.1) is satisfied for some $x, x' \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and all $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$. Then since $\Delta(\{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}) \subset \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\} \otimes \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$, we observe:

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{(1)}(xx')^{(-1)} \otimes (h_{(2)} \rhd (xx')^{(0)}) &= h_{(1)} x^{(-1)} (x')^{(-1)} \otimes (h_{(2)} \rhd (x^{(0)} (x')^{(0)})) \\
&= h_{(1)} x^{(-1)} (x')^{(-1)} \otimes (h_{(2)} \rhd x^{(0)})(h_{(3)} \rhd (x')^{(0)}) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(-1)} h_{(2)} (x')^{(-1)} \otimes (h_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(0)} (h_{(3)} \rhd (x')^{(0)}) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(-1)} (h_{(2)} \rhd x')^{(-1)} h_{(3)} \otimes (h_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(0)} (h_{(2)} \rhd x')^{(0)} \\
&= ((h_{(1)} \rhd x)(h_{(2)} \rhd x'))^{(-1)} h_{(3)} \otimes ((h_{(1)} \rhd x)(h_{(2)} \rhd x'))^{(0)} \\
&= (h_{(1)} \rhd (xx'))^{(-1)} h_{(2)} \otimes (h_{(1)} \rhd (xx'))^{(0)}
\end{aligned}$$

for $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$. Hence we see that the set of all $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ such that (3.1) holds for all $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ containing $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$. Namely, (3.1) holds for all $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$. Now suppose (3.1) holds for some $h, h' \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ and all $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$. Then we observe:

$$\begin{aligned}
(hh')_{(1)} x^{(-1)} \otimes ((hh')_{(2)} \rhd x^{(0)}) &= h_{(1)} h'_{(1)} x^{(-1)} \otimes ((h_{(2)} h'_{(2)}) \rhd x^{(0)}) \\
&= h_{(1)} h'_{(1)} x^{(-1)} \otimes (h_{(2)} \rhd (h'_{(2)} \rhd x^{(0)})) \\
&= h_{(1)} (h'_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(-1)} h'_{(2)} \otimes (h_{(2)} \rhd (h'_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(0)}) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \rhd (h'_{(1)} \rhd x))^{(-1)} h_{(2)} h'_{(2)} \otimes (h_{(1)} \rhd (h'_{(1)} \rhd x))^{(0)} \\
&= ((h_{(1)} h'_{(1)}) \rhd x)^{(-1)} h_{(2)} h'_{(2)} \otimes ((h_{(1)} h'_{(1)}) \rhd x)^{(0)} \\
&= ((hh')_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(-1)} (hh')_{(2)} \otimes ((hh')_{(1)} \rhd x)^{(0)}
\end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$. Hence we see that the set of all $h \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ such that (3.1) holds for all $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ is a subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ containing $\{K_i^{\pm 1}, F_{i,1}, F_{i,2} \mid i \in I\}$. Namely, (3.1) holds for all $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and $h \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. □

The following proposition is probably well-known, but a source was not quickly found, so we provide a proof here.

Proposition 3.16. *Let H be a $\Bbbk$-bialgebra, A an H-module algebra, and B an algebra in ${}^H_H\mathcal{YD}$. Then the H-module $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$ is an H-module algebra with multiplication given by*

$$(a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b') = a(b^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes b^{(0)}b', \quad \text{for all } a, a' \in A,\ b, b' \in B,$$

where $\triangleright$ is the action of H and $\delta(b) = b^{(-1)} \otimes b^{(0)}$ is the coaction of H in sumless Sweedler notation.

Proof: We first show that $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$ is indeed an associative algebra under the prescribed multiplication. For $a, a', a'' \in A$ and $b, b', b'' \in B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
((a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b'))(a'' \otimes b'') &= (a(b^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes b^{(0)}b)(a'' \otimes b'') \\
&= a(b^{(-1)} \triangleright a')((b^{(0)}b')^{(-1)} \triangleright a'') \otimes (b^{(0)}b)^{(0)}b'' \\
&= a(b^{(-1)} \triangleright a')((b^{(0)})^{(-1)}(b')^{(-1)} \triangleright a'') \otimes (b^{(0)})^{(0)}(b')^{(0)}b'' \\
&= a(b^{(-2)} \triangleright a')(b^{(-1)}(b')^{(-1)} \triangleright a'') \otimes b^{(0)}(b')^{(0)}b'' \\
&= a(b^{(-1)} \triangleright (a'((b')^{(-1)} \triangleright a''))) \otimes b^{(0)}(b')^{(0)}b'' \\
&= (a \otimes b)(a'((b')^{(-1)} \triangleright a'') \otimes (b')^{(0)}b'') \\
&= (a \otimes b)((a' \otimes b')(a'' \otimes b'')).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the prescribed multiplication is associative. We now verify that $A \otimes_\Bbbk B$ is indeed an H-module algebra. For $h \in H$, $a, a' \in A$, and $b, b' \in B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
h \triangleright ((a \otimes b)(a' \otimes b')) &= h \triangleright (a(b^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes b^{(0)}b') \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright a)(h_{(2)}b^{(-1)} \triangleright a') \otimes (h_{(3)} \triangleright b^{(0)})(h_{(4)} \triangleright b') \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright a)((h_{(2)} \triangleright b)^{(-1)}h_{(3)} \triangleright a') \otimes (h_{(2)} \triangleright b)^{(0)}(h_{(4)} \triangleright b') \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright a)((h_{(2)} \triangleright b)^{(-1)} \triangleright (h_{(3)} \triangleright a')) \otimes (h_{(2)} \triangleright b)^{(0)}(h_{(4)} \triangleright b') \\
&= ((h_{(1)} \triangleright a) \otimes (h_{(2)} \triangleright b))((h_{(3)} \triangleright a') \otimes (h_{(4)} \triangleright b')) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes b))(h_{(2)} \triangleright (a' \otimes b')).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
h \triangleright (1 \otimes 1) &= (h_{(1)} \otimes 1) \otimes (h_{(2)} \triangleright 1) \\
&= \varepsilon(h_{(1)}) \otimes \varepsilon(h_{(2)}) \\
&= \varepsilon(h_{(1)}\varepsilon(h_{(2)})) \otimes 1 \\
&= \varepsilon(h) \otimes 1.
\end{aligned}$$

The proposition is proven. □

Proof of Theorem 2.11

By Propositions 3.15 and 3.16 we may give $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebra structure satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 \otimes x_i)(a \otimes 1) &= K_i(a) \otimes x_i + (q_i - q_i^{-1})F_{i,2}K_i(a) \otimes 1 \\
K_{i,1}^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= K_i^{\pm 1}(a) \otimes K_i^{\pm 1}(x) \\
F_{i,1} \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= F_{i,1}(a) \otimes x + K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes F_{i,1}(x) \\
F_{i,2} \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= F_{i,2}(a) \otimes K_i^{-1}(x) + a \otimes F_{i,2}(x)
\end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$, $a \in A$, and $x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U]$.

Now by Theorem 3.12, there is a left action of $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_-)$ on $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
F_i \triangleright (a \otimes x) &= F_{i,1} \triangleright (a \otimes x) + \frac{(1 \otimes x_i)(a \otimes x) - (K_i^{-1} \triangleright (a \otimes x))(1 \otimes x_i)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \\
&= F_{i,1}(a) \otimes x + \frac{K_i(a) \otimes x_i x + (q_i - q_i^{-1}) F_{i,2} K_i(a) \otimes x - K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes K_i^{-1}(x) x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \\
&= (F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2} K_i(a)) \otimes x + \frac{K_i(a) \otimes x_i x - K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes K_i^{-1}(x) x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \\
&= (F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2} K_i(a)) \otimes x + \frac{K_i(a) \otimes x_i x - K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes x_i x + K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes x_i x - K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes K_i^{-1}(x) x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \\
&= (F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2} K_i(a)) \otimes x + \frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \otimes x_i x + K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes F_i(x),
\end{aligned}$$

matching the proposed action of F_i.

Furthermore, it is obvious that $E_i \triangleright (a \otimes x) = a \otimes E_i(x)$ yields a well-defined action of $U_q(\mathfrak{n}_+)$ on $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$. It is now straight-forward to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (K_j^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes x)) &= K_j^{\pm 1} \triangleright (K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes x)) \\
K_i \triangleright (E_j \triangleright (K_i^{-1}((a \otimes x)))) &= q_i^{c_{i,j}} E_j \triangleright (a \otimes x) \\
K_i \triangleright (F_j \triangleright (K_i^{-1}((a \otimes x)))) &= q_i^{-c_{i,j}} F_j \triangleright (a \otimes x) \\
E_i \triangleright (F_j \triangleright (a \otimes x)) - F_j \triangleright (E_i \triangleright (a \otimes x)) &= \delta_{i,j} \frac{K_i \triangleright (a \otimes x) - K_i^{-1} \triangleright (a \otimes x)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_i^{\pm 1}(1 \otimes 1) &= 1 \otimes 1 \\
E_i(1 \otimes 1) &= 0 \\
F_i(1 \otimes 1) &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have given $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ the structure of a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module. To see that it is in fact a module algebra, we need to check the following.

$$K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright ((a \otimes x)(a' \otimes x')) = (K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes x))(K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a' \otimes x')) \tag{3.2}$$

$$E_i \triangleright ((a \otimes x)(a' \otimes x')) = (E_i \triangleright (a \otimes x))(K_i \triangleright (a' \otimes x')) + (a \otimes x)(E_i \triangleright (a' \otimes x')) \tag{3.3}$$

$$F_i \triangleright ((a \otimes x)(a' \otimes x')) = (F_i \triangleright (a \otimes x))(a' \otimes x') + (K_i^{-1} \triangleright (a \otimes x))(F_i \triangleright (a' \otimes x')). \tag{3.4}$$

Rather than direct verification, we begin by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
h \triangleright ((a \otimes 1)z) &= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes 1))(h_{(2)} \triangleright z) \text{ and} \\
h \triangleright ((a \otimes x_j)z) &= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes x_j))(h_{(2)} \triangleright z)
\end{aligned}$$

for $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \mid i \in I\}$, $j \in I$, $a \in A$, and $z \in A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$. Let $Y = \{x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U] \mid h \triangleright ((a \otimes x)z) = (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes x))(h_{(2)} \triangleright z)\ \forall a \in A,\ z \in A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U], h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \mid i \in I\}\}$. Y is clearly a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-vector space (containing 1 and x_j). We show that Y is closed under multiplication. Suppose $x, x' \in Y, a \in A, z \in A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$. Then for $h \in \{K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \mid i \in I\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
h \triangleright ((a \otimes xx')z) &= h \triangleright ((a \otimes x)(1 \otimes x')z) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes x))(h_{(2)} \triangleright ((1 \otimes x')z)) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes x))(h_{(2)} \triangleright (1 \otimes x'))(h_{(3)}(z)) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes x)(1 \otimes x'))(h_{(2)}(z)) \\
&= (h_{(1)} \triangleright (a \otimes xx'))(h_{(2)}(z))
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $xx' \in Y$ and we have shown that Y is closed under multiplication. It follows that Y is a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ containing x_j and hence is actually $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ itself. Hence we have verified equations (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4). It follows that the given structure makes $A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ into a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebra. □

3.7. **Proof of Theorem 2.13.** We begin by constructing a natural isomorphism $\psi : (-)^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U] \Rightarrow \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q}$. For every object (A, φ_A) of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, set $\psi_{(A,\varphi_A)} := m_A \circ (\iota_A \otimes \varphi_A)$, where ι_A is the inclusion $A^+ \hookrightarrow A$ and $m_A : A \otimes A \to A$ is multiplication. As an abuse of notation, we will write ψ_A when context is clear. ψ_A is clearly a linear map, so we check that it respects multiplication and is $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-equivariant. One easily computes

$$\psi_A((a \otimes 1)(a' \otimes x')) = \psi_A(a \otimes 1)\psi_A(a' \otimes x') \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_A((a \otimes x_i)(a' \otimes x')) = \psi_A(a \otimes x_i)\psi_A(a' \otimes x').$$

Let $Y = \{x \in \mathbb{C}_q[U] \mid \psi_A((a \otimes x)z) = \psi_A(a \otimes x)\psi_A(z)\ \forall a \in A, z \in A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]\}$. We have seen that $1, x_i \in Y$ for $i \in I$, so the computations

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_A((a \otimes (x+y))z) &= \psi_A((a \otimes x)z + (a \otimes y)z) \\
&= \psi_A((a \otimes x)z) + \psi_A((a \otimes y)z) \\
&= \psi_A(a \otimes x)\psi_A(z) + \psi_A(a \otimes y)\psi_A(z) \\
&= (\psi_A(a \otimes x) + \psi_A(a \otimes y))\psi_A(z) \\
&= \psi_A(a \otimes (x+y))\psi_A(z)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_A((a \otimes xy)z) &= \psi_A((a \otimes x)(1 \otimes y)z) \\
&= \psi_A(a \otimes x)\psi_A((1 \otimes y)z) \\
&= \psi_A(a \otimes x)\psi_A(1 \otimes y)\psi_A(z) \\
&= \psi_A((a \otimes x)(1 \otimes y))\psi_A(z) \\
&= \psi_A((a \otimes xy))\psi_A(z)
\end{aligned}$$

show that Y is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ containing a generating set. Hence $Y = \mathbb{C}_q[U]$, i.e. ψ_A is a homomorphism of algebras. Now we verify that ψ_A is $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-invariant. For $i \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
K_i^{\pm 1}(\psi_A(a \otimes x)) &= K_i^{\pm 1}(a\varphi_A(x)) \\
&= K_i^{\pm 1}(a)K_i^{\pm 1}(\varphi_A(x)) \\
&= K_i^{\pm 1}(a)\varphi_A(K_i^{\pm 1}(x)) \\
&= \psi_A(K_i^{\pm 1}(a) \otimes K_i^{\pm 1}(x)) \\
&= \psi_A(K_i^{\pm 1} \triangleright (a \otimes x))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
E_i(\psi_A(a \otimes x)) &= E_i(a\varphi_A(x)) \\
&= E_i(a)K_i(\varphi_A(x)) + aE_i(\varphi_A(x)) \\
&= a\varphi_A(E_i(x)) \\
&= \psi_A(a \otimes E_i(x)) \\
&= \psi_A(E_i \triangleright (a \otimes x))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
F_i(\psi_A(a \otimes x)) &= F_i(a\varphi_A(x)) \\
&= F_i(a)\varphi_A(x) + K_i^{-1}(a)F_i(\varphi_A(x)) \\
&= \left(F_i(a) - \frac{\varphi_A(x_i)a - K_i^{-1}(a)\varphi_A(x_i)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\right)\varphi_A(x) + \frac{\varphi_A(x_i)a - K_i(a)\varphi_A(x_i)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\varphi_A(x) \\
&\quad + \frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\varphi_A(x_i)\varphi_A(x) + K_i^{-1}(a)\varphi_A(F_i(x)) \\
&= (F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2}K_i(a))\,\varphi_A(x) + \frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\varphi(x_i x) + K_i^{-1}(a)\varphi_A(F_i(x)) \\
&= \psi_A\left((F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2}K_i(a)) \otimes x + \frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \otimes x_i x + K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes F_i(x)\right) \\
&= \psi_A(F_i \triangleright (a \otimes x))
\end{aligned}$$

So ψ_A is a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules and thus a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. By Theorem 2.3, ψ_A is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_A \circ (1 \otimes \mathrm{id}) &= m_A \circ (\iota_A \otimes \varphi_A) \circ (1 \otimes \mathrm{id}) \\ &= m_A \circ (1 \otimes \varphi_A) \\ &= \varphi_A\end{aligned}$$

Hence ψ_A is a morphism of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$. To show that ψ_A is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$, we make the following easy observation.

Lemma 3.17. *A morphism between objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ is an isomorphism if and only if the underlying homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras is an isomorphism.*

Proof: It is clear that the homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras which underlies an isomorphism between objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ is actually an isomorphism, so we simply show the converse. Let (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) be objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ and $\xi : A \to B$ a morphism between them such that ξ is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. Then $\xi \circ \varphi_A = \varphi_B$. Hence we have $\xi^{-1} \circ \varphi_B = \xi^{-1} \circ \xi \circ \varphi_A = \varphi_A$ and so ξ^{-1} is a morphism $(B, \varphi_B) \to (A, \varphi_A)$. Thus ξ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$. □

Hence ψ_A is actually an isomorphism in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$. If we can show that $\psi := (\psi_A)_{(A,\varphi_A)\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q}$ is a natural transformation between $(-)^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q}$, then we will have shown that it is a natural isomorphism. Let (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) be objects of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q$ and $\xi : A \to B$ a morphism. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_B \circ (\xi|_{A^+} \otimes \mathrm{id}) &= m_B \circ (\iota_B \otimes \varphi_B) \circ (\xi|_{A^+} \otimes \mathrm{id}) \\ &= m_B \circ (\xi|_{A^+} \otimes \varphi_B) \\ &= m_B \circ (\xi|_{A^+} \otimes (\xi \circ \varphi_A)) \\ &= m_B \circ (\xi \otimes \xi) \circ (\iota_A \otimes \varphi_A) \\ &= \xi \circ m_A \circ (\iota_A \otimes \varphi_A) \\ &= \xi \circ \psi_A\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\psi : (-)^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U] \Rightarrow \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q}$ is a natural transformation and therefore a natural isomorphism.

Now for every $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module A, let $\eta_A = \mathrm{id} \otimes 1 : A \to (A \otimes \mathbb{C}_q[U])^+$. Then η_A is obviously an injective homomorphism of algebras. We need to show that η_A is a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$-module algebras, namely that η_A respects the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. So we make the following computations.

$$\begin{aligned}K_i^{\pm 1}(\eta_A(a)) &= K_i^{\pm 1}(a \otimes 1) \\ &= K_i^{\pm 1}(a) \otimes 1 \\ &= \eta_A(K_i^{\pm 1}(a))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}F_{i,1}(\eta_A(a)) &= F_{i,1}(a \otimes 1) \\ &= F_i(a \otimes 1) - \frac{(1 \otimes x_i)(a \otimes 1) - K_i^{-1}(a \otimes 1)(1 \otimes x_i)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \\ &= (F_{i,1}(a) + F_{i,2}K_i(a)) \otimes 1 + \frac{K_i(a) - K_i^{-1}(a)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \otimes x_i - \frac{K_i(a) \otimes x_i + F_{i,2}K_i(a) \otimes 1 - K_i^{-1}(a) \otimes x_i}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \\ &= F_{i,1}(a) \otimes 1 \\ &= \eta_A(F_{i,1}(a))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{i,2}(\eta_A(a)) &= F_{i,2}(a\otimes 1)\\
&= \frac{(1\otimes x_i)K_i^{-1}(a\otimes 1)-(a\otimes 1)(1\otimes x_i)}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}\\
&= \frac{(1\otimes x_i)(K_i^{-1}(a)\otimes 1)-a\otimes x_i}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}\\
&= \frac{K_iK_i^{-1}(a)\otimes x_i+(q_i-q_i^{-1})F_{i,2}K_iK_i^{-1}(a)\otimes 1-a\otimes x_i}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}\\
&= F_{i,2}(a)\otimes 1\\
&= \eta_A(F_{i,2}(a))
\end{aligned}$$

Hence η_A respects the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Our last step is to show that η_A is surjective. Given an arbitrary element $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k\otimes x_{\mathbf{j}_k}\in (A\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U])^+$ with $\mathbf{j}_k<\mathbf{j}_l$ if $k<l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k\otimes x_{\mathbf{j}_k} &= E_{\mathbf{i}}^{(top)}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k\otimes x_{\mathbf{j}_k}\right)\\
&= a_n\otimes 1
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(A\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U])^+ = A\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)$, so η_A is surjective and therefore an isomorphism. One easily checks that $\eta := (\eta_A)_{A\in U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)-\mathbf{ModAlg}}$ is a natural transformation. Since each η_A is an isomorphism, η is a natural isomorphism $\eta : \mathrm{id}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)-\mathbf{ModAlg}} \Rightarrow (-\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U])^+$.

We have now shown that $(-)^+\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U]\cong \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^q}$ and $(-\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U])^+\cong \mathrm{id}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)-\mathbf{ModAlg}}$, so $\mathbb{C}_q[U]\otimes -$ and $(-)^+$ are quasi-inverse equivalences of categories. □

3.8. **Proof of Proposition 2.16.** We know by Theorem 2.3 that $A\cong A^+\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and $B\cong B^+\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U]$ and Theorem 2.13 says this is an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module algebras. We now consider the map

$$\mu_L : (A\underline{\otimes}B)^+\otimes[\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}_q[U])\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)]\to A\underline{\otimes}B\cong (A^+\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U])\underline{\otimes}(B^+\otimes\mathbb{C}_q[U])$$

as in Theorem 2.3. As in the proof of Corollary 2.6 (Section 3.4), $\mu_L((A\underline{\otimes}B)^+\otimes[\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}_q[U])\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)])$ is a subalgebra of $A\underline{\otimes}B$. Since $A^+\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)$, $\mathbb{C}(q)\otimes B^+$, and $\{\varphi_A(x_i)\otimes 1-1\otimes\varphi_B(x_i)\mid i\in I\}$ are all contained in $(A\underline{\otimes}B)^+$ and $\{\varphi_A(x_i)\otimes 1\mid i\in I\}\subseteq\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}_q[U])\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)$, it follows that $\mu_L((A\underline{\otimes}B)^+\otimes[\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}_q[U])\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)])$ contains all of these sets. Hence $\mu_L((A\underline{\otimes}B)^+\otimes[\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}_q[U])\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)])$ contains a generating set of $A\underline{\otimes}B$. Being a subalgebra, it follows that $\mu_L((A\underline{\otimes}B)^+\otimes[\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}_q[U])\otimes\mathbb{C}(q)]) = A\underline{\otimes}B$, i.e. μ_L is surjective. Hence μ_L is an isomorphism and by Theorem 2.3, $A\underline{\otimes}B$ is adapted and $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A\underline{\otimes}B\setminus\{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}_q[U]\setminus\{0\})\ \forall\mathbf{i}\in R(w_0)$. Since $A\underline{\otimes}B$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-weight module algebra and $1\otimes\varphi_B$ and $\varphi_A\otimes 1$ are injections, the proposition follows. □

3.9. **Proof of Proposition 2.17.** $A\otimes B$ is naturally viewed as a subspace of $A*B$ (or $A\star B$ if you prefer) via $a\otimes b\mapsto(a\otimes 1)\otimes(b\otimes 1)$. In fact, this subspace is actually a subalgebra since

$$((a\otimes 1)\otimes(b\otimes 1))((a'\otimes 1)\otimes(b'\otimes 1)) = q^{\sum_{i,j} d_i(C^{-1})_{i,j}(\alpha_i^\vee,|b|)(\alpha_j^\vee,|a'|)}(aa'\otimes 1)\otimes(bb'\otimes 1)$$

for weight vectors $a,a'\in A$ and $b,b'\in B$ of weight $|a|,|a'|,|b|$, and $|b'|$, respectively. Hence we may equip $A\otimes B$ with this multiplication.

By design, the prescribed actions of K_i and $F_{i,1}$ on $A\otimes B$ match those on $(A\otimes\mathbb{C}(q))\otimes(B\otimes\mathbb{C}(q))\subset A*B$, while the prescribed actions of $K_i^{\pm 1}$ and $F_{i,2}$ match those on $(A\otimes\mathbb{C}(q))\otimes(B\otimes\mathbb{C}(q))\subset A\star B$. A straightforward check verifies that $F_{i,1}\triangleright(F_{j,2}\triangleright(a\otimes b)) = F_{j,2}\triangleright(F_{i,1}\triangleright(a\otimes b))$ for $a\in A,\ b\in B$, and $i,j\in I$, so it follows that the prescribed action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ on $A\otimes B$ is well-defined and compatible with multiplication. □

3.10. **Proofs of Theorems 2.23 and 2.26.** We begin with a theorem analogous to Theorem 3.9.

Theorem 3.18. *Let H be a Hopf algebra over a field $\Bbbk$ and suppose A is an H-module algebra containing H as a subalgebra. Then giving A the structure of an H-module algebra via the adjoint action:*

$$h\triangleright a = h_{(1)}aS(h_{(2)})\quad \textit{for } h\in H,\ a\in A,$$

the linear map $\tau := (m \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \iota \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \Delta) : A \rtimes H \to A \otimes_{\Bbbk} H$ *is an algebra isomorphism with inverse* $\tau^{-1} = (m \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \iota \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes S \otimes id) \circ (id \otimes \Delta)$*, where* $\iota : H \hookrightarrow A$ *is the inclusion.*

Proof: We first verify that τ and τ^{-1} are truly mutually inverse (and hence that we are justified in using the name τ^{-1}). For $a \in A$ and $h \in H$, we directly compute

$$\begin{aligned}(\tau \circ \tau^{-1})(a \otimes h) &= \tau(aS(h_{(1)}) \otimes h_{(2)}) \\ &= aS(h_{(1)})h_{(2)} \otimes h_{(3)} \\ &= a\varepsilon(h_{(1)}) \otimes h_{(2)} \\ &= a \otimes \varepsilon(h_{(1)})h_{(2)} \\ &= a \otimes h\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\tau^{-1} \circ \tau)(a \otimes h) &= \tau^{-1}(ah_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)}) \\ &= ah_{(1)}S(h_{(2)}) \otimes h_{(3)} \\ &= a\varepsilon(h_{(1)}) \otimes h_{(2)} \\ &= a \otimes \varepsilon(h_{(1)})h_{(2)} \\ &= a \otimes h.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau \circ \tau^{-1}$ and $\tau^{-1} \circ \tau$ act as the identity on pure tensors, they are both the identity homomorphism. Hence τ and τ^{-1} are mutually inverse. We conclude by verifying that τ is actually a homomorphism of algebras (and then τ^{-1} automatically is as well).

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(a \otimes h)\tau(a' \otimes h') &= (ah_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)})(a'h'_{(1)} \otimes h'_{(2)}) \\ &= ah_{(1)}a'h'_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)}h'_{(2)} \\ &= ah_{(1)}a'h'_{(1)} \otimes \varepsilon(h_{(2)})h_{(3)}h'_{(2)} \\ &= ah_{(1)}a'\varepsilon(h_{(2)})h'_{(1)} \otimes h_{(3)}h'_{(2)} \\ &= ah_{(1)}a'S(h_{(2)})h_{(3)}h'_{(1)} \otimes h_{(4)}h'_{(2)} \\ &= a(h_{(1)} \triangleright a')h_{(2)}h'_{(1)} \otimes h_{(3)}h'_{(2)} \\ &= \tau(a(h_{(1)} \triangleright a') \otimes h_{(2)}h') \\ &= \tau((a \otimes h)(a' \otimes h'))\end{aligned}$$

Again, since pure tensors span $A \otimes_{\Bbbk} H$ and τ is a linear map, it follows that τ respects multiplication. The theorem is proved. □

We now apply Theorem 3.18 to the situation when $\Bbbk = \mathbb{C}(q)$ and $H = A = U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$, yielding a trivializing isomorphism $\tau : U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \to U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$. Now we also have an embedding of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$-module algebras $\mathbb{C}_q[U] \hookrightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$, $x_i \mapsto (q_i - q_i^{-1})F_i$. This induces an embedding of algebras $\iota : \mathbb{C}_q[U] \rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \hookrightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$. Then applying τ, we have an embedding of algebras $\tau \circ \iota : \mathbb{C}_q[U] \rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \hookrightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\tau \circ \iota)\left(1 \otimes F_i - x_i \otimes \frac{1 - K_i^{-2}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}\right) =& \tau(1 \otimes F_i - F_i \otimes (1 - K_i^{-2})) \\ =& F_i \otimes 1 + K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i - F_i \otimes 1 + F_iK_i^{-2} \otimes K_i^{-2} \\ =& K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i + F_iK_i^{-2} \otimes K_i^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Now the families $\{K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{F_iK_i^{-2} \otimes K_i^{-2}\}_{i \in I}$ clearly satisfy the quantum Serre relations and

$$\begin{aligned}(F_jK_j^{-2} \otimes K_j^{-2})(K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i) &= F_jK_j^{-2}K_i^{-1} \otimes K_j^{-2}F_i \\ &= q_i^{c_{i,j}}K_i^{-1}F_jK_j^{-2} \otimes F_iK_j^{-2} \\ &= q_i^{c_{i,j}}(K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i)(F_jK_j^{-2} \otimes K_j^{-2})\end{aligned}$$

for $i,j \in I$. Then by Lemma 3.14, the family $\{K_i^{-1}\otimes F_i + F_iK_i^{-2}\otimes K_i^{-2}\}_{i\in I}$ $\left(\text{and therefore } \left\{1\otimes F_i - x_i\otimes \frac{1-K_i^{-2}}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}\right\}_{i\in I}\right)$ must also satisfy the quantum Serre relations. Since

$$(1\otimes K_i)\left(1\otimes F_i - x_i\otimes\frac{1-K_i^{-2}}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}\right)(1\otimes K_i^{-1}) = q_i^{-c_{i,j}}\left(1\otimes F_i - x_i\otimes\frac{1-K_i^{-2}}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}\right),$$

there is a well-defined homomorphism of algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to \mathbb{C}_q[U]\rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ such that $K_i^{\pm 1}\mapsto 1\otimes K_i^{\pm 1}$, $F_i\mapsto 1\otimes F_i - x_i\otimes\frac{1-K_i^{-2}}{q_i-q_i^{-1}}$.

We now wish to dequantize the above map. Set $\mathscr{A} = \{g\in\mathbb{C}(q) \mid g \text{ is regular at } q=1\}$, a local subring of $\mathbb{C}(q)$ with maximal ideal $(q-1)\mathscr{A}$. Denote by $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}$ the $\mathscr{A}$-subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ generated by $\left\{F_i, \frac{K_i^{\pm 1}-1}{q_i-1} \mid \forall i\in I\right\}$. In fact, it is a Hopf subalgebra over $\mathscr{A}$. Then $(\mathscr{A}\mathcal{B}^{dual})\rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}$ is an $\mathscr{A}$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}_q[U]\rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$. Hence the above map restricts to a homomorphism of $\mathscr{A}$-algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}\to(\mathscr{A}\mathcal{B}^{dual})\rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}$, inducing a homomorphism of $\mathbb{C}$-algebras

$$U(\mathfrak{b}_-) = U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}/(q-1)U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}} \to [(\mathscr{A}\mathcal{B}^{dual})\rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}]/(q-1)[(\mathscr{A}\mathcal{B}^{dual})\rtimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)_{\mathscr{A}}] = \mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-).$$

Hence the following proposition is proven.

Proposition 3.19. *The assignments $h_i\mapsto 1\otimes h_i$ and $f_i\mapsto 1\otimes f_i - x_i\otimes h_i$ define a homomorphism of algebras $\hat{}: U(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to\mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$.*

Another (less interesting) proof of Proposition 3.19 involves showing by induction that the elements $\hat{f}_i = 1\otimes f_i - x_i\otimes h_i\in\mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ satisfy

$$(\text{ad }\hat{f}_i)^{(n)}(\hat{f}_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\prod_{\ell=n-k}^{n-1}(c_{i,j}+\ell)\right)\left[x_i^{(k)}\otimes(\text{ad }f_i)^{(n-k)}(f_j) - \frac{d_i}{d_j}x_i^{(k-1)}f_i^{(n-k)}(x_j)\otimes f_i \right.$$
$$\left. -\frac{1}{d_j}x_i^{(k)}f_i^{(n-k)}(x_j)\otimes((n-k)d_ih_i + d_jh_j)\right]$$

where we use the conventions $(\text{ad }x)(y) = xy - yx$ and $x_i^{(-1)} = 0$. Setting $n = 1-c_{i,j}$ and using Remark 2.21, we verify that

$$(\text{ad }\hat{f}_i)^{(1-c_{i,j})}(\hat{f}_j) = 0.$$

In any case, we are now ready to prove Theorem 2.23.

Proof of Theorem 2.23

Since A contains $\mathbb{C}[U]$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra, there is an action of $\mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ on A given by $(x\otimes g)\blacktriangleright a = xg(a)$. Then $\hat{}: U(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to\mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ gives rise to an action of $U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ on A via $g\triangleright a = \hat{g}\blacktriangleright a$. Under this action, we have

$$h_i\triangleright a = (1\otimes h_i)\blacktriangleright a = h_i(a) \quad\text{and}\quad f_i\triangleright a = (1\otimes f_i - x_i\otimes h_i)\blacktriangleright a = f_i(a) - x_ih_i(a)$$

as prescribed. That A^+ is invariant under this action is an easy computation that we won't produce here. □

Theorem 2.23 of course gives rise to a "new" $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra structure on $\mathbb{C}[U]$, satisfying

$$h_i(x_j) = -c_{i,j}x_j$$
$$h_i(\{x,y\}) = \{h_i(x),y\} + \{x,h_i(y)\}$$
$$f_i(x) = \frac{1}{2d_i}\{x_i,x\} - \frac{1}{2}x_ih_i(x)$$

for $i\in I$ and $x,y\in\mathbb{C}[U]$. To distinguish $\mathbb{C}[U]$ equipped with this action from that with the usual action, we will use $\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}$ to denote the algebra $\mathbb{C}[U]$ equipped with the "new" action. As with $\mathbb{C}[U]$, we can form the cross product $\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$.

We now consider the well-known homomorphism of algebras $s:\mathbb{C}[U]\to\mathbb{C}[U]$ defined by the assignments $s(x_i) = -x_i$ for $i\in I$ and $s(\{x,y\}) = -\{s(x),s(y)\}$ for $x,y\in\mathbb{C}[U]$. We will examine the linear map $s\otimes id:\mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$, but first we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.20. *Given a field $\Bbbk$, let H be a $\Bbbk$-bialgebra generated (as a $\Bbbk$-algebra) by the subset X, A an H-module algebra, and B any $\Bbbk$-algebra with multiplication $\mu_B : B \otimes_\Bbbk B \to B$. Given homomorphisms of $\Bbbk$-algebras $\varphi_1 : A \to B$ and $\varphi_2 : H \to B$, the $\Bbbk$-linear map $\mu_B \circ (\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2) : A \rtimes H \to B$ is a homomorphism of algebras if and only if*

$$\varphi_2(h)\varphi_1(a) = \varphi_1(h_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h_{(2)}) \tag{3.5}$$

for all $h \in X$ and $a \in A$, where we use sumless Sweedler notation: $\Delta(h) = h_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)}$.

Proof: To simplify notation, we write $\phi := \mu_B \circ (\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2)$.

($\Rightarrow$) If ϕ is a homomorphism of algebras, then for $h \in X$ and $a \in A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_2(h)\varphi_1(a) &= \phi(1 \otimes h)\phi(a \otimes 1)\\ &= \phi((1 \otimes h)(a \otimes 1))\\ &= \phi(h_{(1)}(a) \otimes h_{(2)})\\ &= \varphi_1(h_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h_{(2)}).\end{aligned}$$

($\Leftarrow$) Let Y be the subset of H consisting of elements h such that (3.5) holds for all $a \in A$. By assumption, $X \subset Y$, so showing that Y is a subalgebra of H is equivalent to showing that $Y = H$. We compute for $h, h' \in Y$ and $a \in A$:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_2(h+h')\varphi_1(a) &= (\varphi_2(h) + \varphi_2(h'))\varphi_1(a)\\ &= \varphi_2(h)\varphi_1(a) + \varphi_2(h')\varphi_1(a)\\ &= \varphi_1(h_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h_{(2)}) + \varphi_1(h'_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h'_{(2)})\\ &= \varphi_1((h+h')_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2((h+h')_{(2)})\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_2(hh')\varphi_1(a) &= \varphi_2(h)\varphi_2(h')\varphi_1(a)\\ &= \varphi_2(h)\varphi_1(h'_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h'_{(2)})\\ &= \varphi_1(h_{(1)}h'_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h_{(2)})\varphi_2(h'_{(2)})\\ &= \varphi_1(h_{(1)}h'_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2(h_{(2)}h'_{(2)})\\ &= \varphi_1((hh')_{(1)}(a))\varphi_2((hh')_{(2)}).\end{aligned}$$

So we see that Y is a closed under addition and multiplication. Since it obviously contains 1, Y is a subalgebra of H and hence $Y = H$. Thus (3.5) holds for all $h \in H$ and $a \in A$. Now we compute for $h, h' \in H$ and $a, a' \in A$:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(a \otimes h)\phi(a' \otimes h') &= \varphi_1(a)\varphi_2(h)\varphi_1(a')\varphi_2(h')\\ &= \varphi_1(a)\varphi_1(h_{(1)}(a'))\varphi_2(h_{(2)})\varphi_2(h')\\ &= \varphi_1(ah_{(1)}(a'))\varphi_2(h_{(2)}h')\\ &= \phi(ah_{(1)}(a') \otimes h_{(2)}h')\\ &= \phi((a \otimes h)(a' \otimes h')).\end{aligned}$$

Since we already knew that ϕ was a $\Bbbk$-linear map, it follows that ϕ is a homomorphism of $\Bbbk$-algebras. □

Proposition 3.21. *The linear map $s \otimes id : \mathbb{C}[U] \rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-) \to \mathbb{C}[U]^{op} \rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ is a homomorphism of algebras.*

Proof: By Lemma 3.20, it suffices to show that $(1 \otimes h_i)(s(x) \otimes 1) = s(h_i(x)) \otimes 1 + s(x) \otimes h_i$ and $(1 \otimes f_i)(s(x) \otimes 1) = s(f_i(x)) \otimes 1 + s(x) \otimes f_i$ for $i \in I$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}[U]$. It is clear that s respects the action of h_i, namely $h_i(s(x)) = s(h_i(x))$ for $i \in I$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}[U]$, so

$$\begin{aligned}(1 \otimes h_i)(s(x) \otimes 1) &= h_i(s(x)) \otimes 1 + s(x) \otimes h_i\\ &= s(h_i(x)) \otimes 1 + s(x) \otimes h_i\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1\otimes f_i)(s(x)\otimes 1) &= f_i(s(x))\otimes 1 + s(x)\otimes f_i\\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2d_i}\{x_i, s(x)\} - \frac{1}{2}x_i h_i(s(x))\right)\otimes 1 + s(x)\otimes f_i\\ &= \left(-\frac{1}{2d_i}\{s(x_i), s(x)\} + \frac{1}{2}s(x_i)s(h_i(x))\right)\otimes 1 + s(x)\otimes f_i\\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2d_i}s(\{x_i, x\}) + \frac{1}{2}s(x_i h_i(x))\right)\otimes 1 + s(x)\otimes f_i\\ &= s\left(\frac{1}{2d_i}\{x_i, x\} + \frac{1}{2}x_i h_i(x)\right)\otimes 1 + s(x)\otimes f_i\\ &= s(f_i(x))\otimes 1 + s(x)\otimes f_i.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $s\otimes \mathrm{id}$ is a homomorphism of algebras. □

We're now ready to prove Theorem 2.26.

Proof of Theorem 2.26

We observe that $A\otimes\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}$ is naturally a $\mathfrak{b}_-$-module algebra and therefore is also a $\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$-module.

Lemma 3.22. *There is a homomorphism of algebras $U(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ given on generators by*

$$h_i\mapsto 1\otimes h_i \quad \textit{and} \quad f_i\mapsto 1\otimes f_i + x_i\otimes h_i.$$

Proof: We already saw that there is a homomorphism of algebras $\hat{}: U(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to\mathbb{C}[U]\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ given on generators by

$$\hat{h}_i = 1\otimes h_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_i = 1\otimes f_i - x_i\otimes h_i.$$

Then the composition $(s\otimes\mathrm{id})\circ\hat{}: U(\mathfrak{b}_-)\to\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}\rtimes U(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ has

$$\begin{aligned}(s\otimes\mathrm{id})(\hat{h}_i) &= (s\otimes\mathrm{id})(1\otimes h_i)\\ &= 1\otimes h_i\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(s\otimes\mathrm{id})(\hat{f}_i) &= (s\otimes\mathrm{id})(1\otimes f_i - x_i\otimes h_i)\\ &= 1\otimes f_i + x_i\otimes h_i\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 3.22 induces a different action of $\mathfrak{b}_-$ on $A\otimes\mathbb{C}[U]^{op}$, namely

$$\begin{aligned}h_i\triangleright(a\otimes x) &= h_i(a)\otimes x + a\otimes h_i(x)\\ f_i\triangleright(a\otimes x) &= f_i(a)\otimes x + a\otimes f_i(x) + h_i(a)\otimes x_i x + a\otimes x_i h_i(x)\\ &= f_i(a)\otimes x + h_i(a)\otimes x_i x + a\otimes\left(\frac{1}{2d_i}\{x_i, x\} - \frac{1}{2}x_i h_i(x) + x_i h_i(x)\right)\\ &= f_i(a)\otimes x + h_i(a)\otimes x_i x + a\otimes\left(\frac{1}{2d_i}\{x_i, x\} + \frac{1}{2}x_i h_i(x)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Hence there is a well-defined action of $\mathfrak{b}_-$ on $A\otimes\mathbb{C}[U]$ (note the lack of *op*) given by

$$h_i\triangleright(a\otimes x) = h_i(a)\otimes x + a\otimes h_i(x), \quad f_i\triangleright(a\otimes x) = f_i(a)\otimes x + h_i(a)\otimes x_i x + a\otimes f_i(x)$$

as prescribed in the theorem. It is clear by definition that the family of operators $\{1\otimes e_i\}_{i\in I}$ which define the action of e_i satisfy the Serre relations. It is also easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}h_i\triangleright(e_j\triangleright(a\otimes x)) - e_j\triangleright(h_i\triangleright(a\otimes x)) &= c_{i,j}e_j\triangleright(a\otimes x)\\ h_i\triangleright(f_j\triangleright(a\otimes x)) - f_j\triangleright(h_i\triangleright(a\otimes x)) &= -c_{i,j}f_j\triangleright(a\otimes x)\\ e_i\triangleright(f_j\triangleright(a\otimes x)) - f_j\triangleright(e_i\triangleright(a\otimes x)) &= \delta_{i,j}h_i\triangleright(a\otimes x).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have a well-defined action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $A \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$. It is clear that each e_i and f_i acts by derivations and $e_i(1 \otimes 1) = f_i(1 \otimes 1) = 0$, so the theorem is proved. □

3.11. **Proof of Proposition 2.29.** We simply show that if (A, φ_A) and (B, φ_B) are objects of $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{g}$, then $A \otimes B$ is adapted with $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \otimes B \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U] \setminus \{0\})$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$. By Theorem 2.19, it suffices to show that the map $\mu : (A \otimes B)^+ \otimes (\varphi_A(\mathbb{C}[U]) \otimes \mathbb{C}(q)) \to A \otimes B$ is surjective. Again by Theorem 2.19, we know that $A \cong A^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$ and $B \cong B^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]$. Theorem 2.28 says that these are isomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebras. We observe that the following elements are contained in the image of μ: $a \otimes 1$ for $a \in A^+$, $1 \otimes b$ for $b \in B^+$, $\varphi_A(x_i) \otimes 1$ for $i \in I$, and $\varphi_A(x_i) \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \varphi_B(x_i)$ for $i \in I$. In fact, the image of μ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra of $A \otimes B$.

Lemma 3.23. *Let C be a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra containing $\mathbb{C}[U]$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra and let $\mu : C^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U] \to C$ be restriction of multiplication to these subalgebras. Then the image of μ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module subalgebra of C.*

Proof: μ is $\mathbb{C}$-linear, so it suffices to check that the subspace spanned by the images of pure tensors $c \otimes x$ is closed under multiplication and the $\mathfrak{g}$-action. Since $\mu(c \otimes x) = cx$, we check only on elements of this form.

$$\begin{aligned}
(cx)(c'x') &= (cc')(xx') \\
&= \mu(cc' \otimes xx') \\
&\in \mu(C^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]) \\
e_i(cx) &= ce_i(x) \\
&= \mu(c \otimes e_i(x)) \\
&\in \mu(C^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]) \\
f_i(cx) &= (f_i(c) - h_i(c)x_i)x + h_i(c)x_ix + cf_i(x) \\
&= \mu((f_i(c) - h_i(c)x_i) \otimes x + h_i(c) \otimes x_ix + c \otimes f_i(x)) \\
&\in \mu(C^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]).
\end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. □

Since the image of μ contains a generating set for $A \otimes B$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module algebra (see Remark 2.21), we conclude that μ is surjective. Hence μ is an isomorphism and so, by Theorem 2.19, $A \otimes B$ is adapted with $\nu_{\mathbf{i}}(A \otimes B \setminus \{0\}) = \nu_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U] \setminus \{0\})$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in R(w_0)$. □

References

[1] A. Berenstein and A. Zelevinsky, Tensor product multiplicities, canonical bases and totally positive varieties, *Invent. Math.*, vol. 143, **1** (2001), 77-128.

[2] E. Damaskinsky, P. Kulish, M. Sokolov, Gauss decomposition for quantum groups and supergroups, arXiv:q-alg/9505001.

[3] Y. Kimura, Remarks on quantum unipotent subgroup and dual canonical bases, arXiv:1506.07912.

[4] G. Lusztig, *Introduction to Quantum Groups*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.

[5] S. Majid, *Foundations of Quantum Group Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Department of Mathematics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
E-mail address: arkadiy@uoregon.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
E-mail address: karls@uoregon.edu